THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A BOOK of exceptional interest comes from the publisher, Basil Blackwell—*The Fourth Gospel as History*,[1] by the late Right Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, C.H., D.D., Bishop of Gloucester. It contains an able biographical essay by Agnes Headlam-Morley and, as an appendix, an examination of the Historical Value of St. Mark's Gospel. But the main part of the book is devoted to the question suggested by the title, and, though there are statements and conclusions in this essay that are familiar to all students of the Gospel, the whole treatment is so fresh and suggestive that it will be found extraordinarily helpful both to the student and the general reader.

There are four divisions in this essay—the aim and purpose of the Gospel, its historical value, its authorship, its teaching. Dr. HEADLAM says that one of the sources of doubt about the Gospel's historical validity is a misconception as to its purpose. Its purpose is not to give a biographical account of Jesus, but to cite incidents which are a witness to Him. It does not claim to be a biography but an apologetic and theological work. The aim of the writer is found in the Preface, which gives in the philosophical language of the time a statement concerning the Person of Christ which is supported and explained in the narrative. It is definitely claimed that the writer was narrating facts and that the history is good. But it is not as history the events are narrated. They are chosen because they exhibit Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God.

The Cleansing of the Temple is a good instance. It is placed by the author at the *beginning* of the Ministry, an unlikely position historically. But the author placed it where it is because it was an event in which Jesus had clearly exhibited His authority as Messiah. And all other incidents have the same purpose. They were selected, not on chronological grounds but to prove the assertion which is the main theme of the Gospel. The stories form the basis on which the theological instruction is built up. 'The fourth evangelist is concerned more with the meaning of the words and actions of Jesus than with their original setting or relative order.' The Gospel is a theological book designed to tell us what we should think of Jesus.

If this be so it clears away many difficulties. But the question remains whether the incidents themselves which the Gospel narrates are good history. Some writers dispose of this question summarily by the suggestion that the events are symbolical. They are allegory, not strict history. Baron von Hügel is a prominent member of this School. To him the Fourth Gospel is the noblest instance of a kind of literature of which the truth depends not on the factual accuracy of the symbolizing appearances but on the truth of the ideas and experiences thus symbolized. The Miracle of Cana tells us how the good wine of the Gospel has taken the place of the old wine of Judaism. The Cleansing of the Temple symbolizes the end of the sacrificial system.

'I do not think,' writes Dr. HEADLAM, 'that this was the view of the author of the Fourth Gospel; I think he told all these stories, whether miracles or not, as historical facts, and considered them as signs of the authority of Jesus.' The value of his argument for himself depends on whether the events he records are true. What is the criterion by which the truth of an incident is to be judged? The answer to that question is this. We ask whether the writer is acquainted with the thought and life of the time and place he is describing, whether he shows a knowledge of geographical details, whether his story agrees with other accounts, whether we notice the presence of irrelevant details which have been introduced because they have been impressed on the memory of an eye-witness, whether there is a life-like vividness about the narrative. All this points not to allegory but to fact.

If we sum up the results of such an examination, we can say that the author of the Fourth Gospel had the other three Gospels before him. He did not in any way attempt to rival them by giving

[1] 7s. 6d. net.

a new biography, but selected such stories as suited his purpose. He generally followed St. Mark. He often adds details which for the most part improve and add point to the narrative and which well may be personal reminiscences. He occasionally corrects the Synoptic story and probably his corrections are sound. 'He may not always be right—no one is—but I see no reason to doubt that he intends to tell us what he believes has really happened and that he gives us for the most part good history.'

Dr. HEADLAM'S conviction about the authorship of the Gospel is quite definite. He has no difficulty in believing that the author was John, the son of Zebedee. He examines patiently the theory that the author was another John, the Presbyter. But he finds no real evidence of the existence of such a person, and the son of Zebedee fulfils every condition of the authorship. What the Gospel demands for its author is some one who had a close intimacy with Jesus and could interpret His thoughts as no one else could. 'I cannot believe,' says Dr. HEADLAM, 'that there was a disciple who could be styled "the disciple whom Jesus loved" who is not mentioned in the other Gospels. The traditional author fills every qualification. It has to be remembered that he could have been present, he probably was present, at every single event recorded in the Gospel.'

And now, finally, about the teaching in the Gospel. Was it Christ's? The main importance of the Fourth Gospel is in the teaching it gives us. It was obviously written for this purpose and this has been its gift to the Christian Church. The writer was an old man when he wrote. Certainly he did not write before A.D. 80, and it may have been later. But it must be remembered that for fifty years he would be preaching and teaching, and that part, probably a considerable part, of his teaching would be telling stories about Jesus. All this would become stereotyped and impressed upon his memory. We are dealing with Jews who were trained to remember. And John would have in his mind the duty of interpreting the teaching of Jesus in such a way that it might appeal to the thoughtful minds of his day.

With that purpose he expressed his belief in Christ by identifying Him with the Word or Logos. This was a stroke of genius, or, to put it in a different way, a sign of inspiration. For the 'Word' or 'Logos' was an expression used in Jewish Biblical theology and had a long history in Greek philosophy. It became in the second century the basis of Christian apology. We notice, however, and this is of the greatest importance, that, while it occupies its proper place in the Prologue to the Gospel, the philosophical language of the Prologue is kept distinct from the teaching ascribed to Jesus. As the author might have put it, 'If you are to understand about Jesus you must look upon Him (to use the language of your philosophers) as the Word of God. In Him the Word about which you tell us so much became incarnate.'

What, then, is the relation of the teaching of Christ as narrated in this Gospel to that of the Synoptic Gospels? The teaching in the Synoptists is expressed in the language natural to the Palestine of Jesus' life. It made use of many expressions, such as 'the Kingdom of Heaven,' 'the Son of Man,' which would not have much meaning to the Greeks of Asia. It needed interpretation. Besides, a great part of the teaching in the Synoptic Gospels was public teaching. But we have clear instances of private teaching to the disciples. We have to remember that there was a good deal of reticence in the public utterances of Jesus. And, finally, there is another reason for the difference in the teaching in 'John' from that in the Synoptists.

In the Synoptists the teaching is in the very words of Jesus, probably written down very early. But the teaching of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is for the most part in the words and style of the Evangelist. It was natural, for example, that there were no parables in John, if the intention was to explain the teaching of Jesus. In order that that might be done the teaching must be translated from the language of Palestine at the beginning of the century into the language of Asia at the end. We may therefore accept the general position that the teaching of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is an interpretation, a translation, an explanation in the language of a later generation. And Dr. HEADLAM gives numerous examples of how this was done. And it may be added that few more convincing arguments on the 'orthodox' side have appeared than are given in this admirable and fascinating essay.

The distinguished Biblical scholar, Professor T. W. MANSON, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., of Manchester, has written a useful and timely little volume, *The Church's Ministry*,[1] which may be regarded as following upon the important work on 'The Apostolic Ministry,' edited by Bishop K. E. Kirk. At many points Dr. MANSON is critical of that work, but, as he tells us, the main purpose of his book is not so much critical as constructive.

[1] Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net.

The book consists of four lectures, of which the first three were given before the University of London, and the fourth at Bradford, as the first C. J. Cadoux Memorial Lecture. It is the substance of the fourth lecture we would here present to our readers. The author had argued in the first three that apostolicity is a quality that belongs to the Church and not to any particular form of ministry; as it is possible to be Protestant *and* Episcopal and Apostolic, so it is possible to be Protestant, non-Episcopal, *and* Apostolic. In the last lecture he treats of 'Non-Episcopal Ministries.'

One way of looking at the Church and the ministry is characteristic of the Episcopal communions. The ministry is conceived as 'a hierarchy organized from above with strictly graded duties determined from above, and carefully differentiated powers conferred from above.' The other way is characteristic of the non-Episcopal communions. The ministry is conceived 'essentially in terms of specific tasks undertaken in obedience to a call of God by the appointment of a particular congregation of believers.' It will be observed that, according to Dr. MANSON, the emphasis in the former case tends to fall on orders and ordination, in the latter on 'calling.'

The two views, the 'Catholic' and the 'Free Church,' are—as he says—not irreconcilable. If they were, it would constitute the strongest possible challenge to the Christian Faith. The only tolerable, and the true, position to take is, not that the question of ministry is fundamentally irrelevant, but that both conceptions as above outlined embody some basic truth which can be found.

If we take seriously the idea of the Body of Christ and the continuation of the Messianic Ministry (a phrase which Dr. MANSON prefers to the continuation of the Incarnation), we are conscious that we are to regard the Church as being a living organism, and this should safeguard us from certain errors. One is to imagine political categories as relevant in the ecclesiastical sphere. 'We misconceive the business in hand when we equate Romanism with absolute monarchy, Anglicanism with aristocracy, and the Free Church systems with democracy.'

Another error is to go back to New Testament times and find there the one standard and pattern in matters of Church life and organization. 'To set up the Church of the first or any other century as the final Court of Appeal, while professing faith in the continuing presence of Christ to His Church and the continuing guidance of His Spirit, seems to me to savour of inconsistency.' While another error, arising from failure to conceive of the Church as a living organism, is to ride away at need on the idea of an 'invisible' Church. 'It is legitimate to distinguish between the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant, but it is not legitimate to distinguish between the Church Visible and the Church Invisible, or between the Church and "the soul of the Church."' There is only one Body of Christ.' The former error is committed by Calvinists, the latter by Romanists.

It is the fact of the supremacy of Christ, the only King and Head of the Church, that constitutes the essential basis of agreement for all the divided communions that belong to the Body; indeed it makes the divisions essentially unreal. As the Principal of the Yorkshire United Independent College has expressed it, 'There is one Lord and there is one essential ministry—His. All other ministries, apostles, prophets, teachers, evangelists, bishops, presbyters, deacons are derivative, functional, and dependent on Him.' Accordingly, so far as a man's qualification to minister is concerned, it makes no difference whether he is ordained by a bishop or a presbytery or a congregation. Because Christ is really present in His Church, no particular man or group of men is essential to an ordination.

Clearly Dr. MANSON raises many points of controversy, but it is his opinion that the two different views of the ministry may be reconciled if they are united in affirming the supremacy and the real presence of Christ in His Church.

Unsolved New Testament Problems.

The 'Son of Man' in the Teaching of Jesus.

By the Reverend Matthew Black, B.D., Ph.D., D.Litt., The University of Leeds.

For our Evangelists, who alone make use of the title 'Son of Man' for Christ, there is no unsolved problem connected with it, only a historical solution. The Son of Man is Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, who came down from heaven, yet on earth found no place to rest His head; who was betrayed, suffered, and died, yet rose again the third day from the dead; who will return again as Judge, with great power and glory, to gather together His elect. His redemptive sufferings were according to the Scriptures; His Coming in Glory is told in language borrowed mainly from Dn 7, from which the title Son of Man is ultimately derived.

The unsolved New Testament problem is the mind and teaching of Jesus Himself about the Son of Man. How far is the historical Christian solution consonant with it? To what extent do we now see Jesus, Son of Man (or Jesus' Son of Man), not directly, but through the distorting medium of later tradition, recorded by unknown writers and evangelists? In particular, to what extent has the original teaching been overlaid by current Jewish apocalyptic ideas about the Son of Man?

The title is found in all strata of the Gospel tradition, and almost exclusively as a self-designation on the lips of Jesus Himself. But this does not mean that every occurrence of it is necessarily early or genuine. Comparison of the Synoptic Gospels reveals a tendency to introduce the name into the records at a later stage: Mt 16^{13} ('Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?') is the most obvious example; Mk 8^{27} has 'Whom do men say that I am?' (cf. Lk 9^{18}). Moreover, the majority of apocalyptic Son of Man sayings stand in discourses which are well known to be artificial and late productions. Several strata of tradition are found in them, and the picture they present is not always self-consistent: Mk $13^{5ff.}$, with its emphasis on the delayed Coming of the Son of Man, contradicts Mt 10^{23} or 16^{28}, where the Parousia is an imminent event; and Mt 16^{28} is itself secondary to Mk 9^{1}.

Nevertheless, there is almost certainly a genuine core of apocalyptic sayings of Jesus within these discourses,[1] and not all the apocalyptic Son of Man sayings outside them are secondary tradition.

To take one example, the saying concluding Luke's Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Importunate Widow (18^{1-8}): 'Howbeit when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?' As an isolated saying, the verse reveals no more and no less than any other single apocalyptic *logion*, but in its context within the preceding Parable, it is illuminating.

Its connexion with the Parable, however, is not immediately obvious; it 'strikes a different note from the urgency of the preceding Parable' (Creed), and many explain it as a redactional supplement (so Bultmann, Klostermann). A logical connexion is, however, established if πίστις is taken in its Old Testament sense of 'constancy' (cf. Hab 2^{4}), the virtue of steadfast loyalty to God, implying constant prayer. Even so, the question still lacks urgency: in its Aramaic form, however, it need not be a question, and the verb can be imperatival:

> 'I say unto you, that He will avenge them speedily; Only, when the Son of Man cometh, *let him find constancy* on the earth.'

What the object of this loyalty and prayerfulness is, is clearly implied in the Parable: it is judgment for the elect at the hands of a Divine Judge. 'The idea of ἐκδίκησις is so closely interwoven with the texture of this story, that if the eschatological element is eliminated from the interpretation, the Parable would lose its main force.'[2] The Unjust Judge gave judgment eventually simply because of the importunate annoyings of the widow. *A fortiori* will God bring speedy judgment in response to the continual cries of His people, for mercy is His chief quality. But is it God Himself who is to be the agent of the Divine justice? It is certainly stated in *v.*8a that it is He who will bring about the ἐκδίκησις, but the assumption that it is He who carries it out overlooks the significance of *v.* 8b; the Coming of the Son of Man implies that *it is He who will act as God's vicegerent in judgment on the earth.*

Here we have all the essential features of the old Biblical Son of Man apocalyptic. If we compare it with Matthew's Judgment scene ($25^{31ff.}$) or his (probably) midrashic interpretation of the Parable of the Tares ($13^{37ff.}$), the main differences are in literary expansion and imaginative embel-

[1] Cf. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* [1937], 287.

[2] J. M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 222.

lishment. The background of Mt 25 is the old Biblical picture of the Similitudes ;[1] both here and at ch. 13, the actual punishment is delegated, as in Enoch, to the angels. But the essentials are all in the Lucan Parable, the originality of which it is impossible to doubt ; it is even coloured, like the Matthæan parables, by language from the Similitudes (*v.* 7, ' his elect ').

The old Biblical Son of Man apocalyptic has not, therefore, been foisted upon the teaching of Jesus by later tradition ; it represents the substance of His teaching about the coming Judgment.

The remarkable thing about this apocalyptic teaching of Jesus about the Coming of the Son of Man is that He frequently, indeed almost consistently, appears to be speaking of some one other than Himself. After Peter's Confession, the reference to His own Person becomes for the most part quite explicit ; and it is, of course, at this point that His teaching about the Son of Man takes on its most characteristic (non-apocalyptic) features. But the historic Confession makes it quite clear that in any apocalyptic teaching about the Son of Man prior to Cæsarea Philippi (and the Gospels record a good deal) *not even His most intimate disciples can have recognized in their Master the coming Son of Man Messiah.*

Did Jesus proclaim the coming of another as Son of Man in the earlier part of His ministry ? Or did the expression Son of Man mean, on His lips, not (or not only) the expected Deliverer, but also the Elect Community to whom the Kingdom is given ? [2]

Professor T. W. Manson has called attention to a number of Son of Man sayings, both apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic, where a communal interpretation is possible ; and he has found in this the clue to the nature of the mission and message of Jesus : the ' Son of Man is, like the Servant of Jehovah, an ideal figure and stands for the manifestation of the Kingdom of God on earth . . .' [3] The final identification of Jesus Himself with the Son of Man is the outcome of His prophetic Ministry.[4]

In the passages discussed by Dr. Manson, the communal meaning is not only possible, but highly probable, and may be the true one, but it is doubtful if, in any case, it is the only one, and nothing short of unambiguous evidence is required to demonstrate the point. Mk $2^{27ff.}$, however, may constitute the notable exception : ' The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath : so that the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath.'

It is a most attractive interpretation which would include the disciples in the ' Son of Man ' (the Elect Community) ; after all ' it is not Jesus who makes free with the Sabbath rules ; nor is it mankind in general. It is the company of His disciples. . . . He and they together, so long as they adhere to Him, constitute the " Son of Man." ' [5]

It was Wellhausen (following several distinguished predecessors from Grotius onwards) who insisted that, if the conclusion at *v.* 28 is to follow logically from the premisses of *v.* 27, then the original Aramaic *barnash(a)* (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) can only have meant ' man ' (generic, as ἄνθρωπος in *v.* 27) ; and this view was originally held by Dr. Manson himself.[6] But this objection to ' Son of Man ' as an eschatological individual holds no less of an eschatological community—we still have a *non sequitur.* The difficulty is, however, anticipated by Dr. Manson who believes the original read : ' The Sabbath was made for the Son of Man, and not the Son of Man for the Sabbath.' In that case, however, apart altogether from the intelligibility of such a saying to its Pharisaic audience, why did the Greek not translate *barnash(a)* ' Son of Man ' in *v.* 27 as it does in *v.* 28 ? The reason is almost certainly that it was not *barnash(a)* which was read in this first verse but *'enash* (ὁ ἄνθρωπος) ; *barnash(a)* stood as a poetic synonym in *v.* 28, exactly as ' son of man ' does in Ps 8^{4}.[7]

If *vv.* 27 and 28 belong together (to sacrifice *v.* 27, as Dalman does, is the easiest way out), and were spoken in this historical situation, then we are obliged by the sheer logic of the first verse to conclude that the second must have at least borne the meaning, ' Therefore is Man Lord even of the Sabbath.' It was probably so understood by the Pharisees. Whether the words were capable of bearing more than this meaning is a suggestion we must meantime postpone.

The Greek evidence as a whole, it seems to me, supports rather than otherwise the distinction between Son of Man as eschatological Individual and the Kingdom of God, of which He is Head. At the same time, some allowance must be made for the richer Semitic content of the Son of Man conception, and for the possibility of a wider use of it (as also of the idea of the Kingdom of God) in the teaching than our Greek Gospels attest.

[1] Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* [London, 1914], 23 ff.

[2] Cf. Vincent Taylor, 'The " Son of Man " Sayings Relating to the Parousia,' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xviii. i. 12 ff.

[3] *The Teaching of Jesus*, 227.

[4] *Ib.*

[5] Manson in *Conjectanea Neotestamentica*, xi. [Anton Friedrichsen *Festschrift*, Lund, 1947], 138 ff.

[6] *The Teaching of Jesus*, 214.

[7] Dalman objected to Wellhausen (*Worte Jesu*, 215 ff.) that if *'enash* stood in *v.* 27, then the same word would also require to have been in the original to give ὁ ἄνθρωπος at *v.* 28. But no account has been taken of the saying in *poetic form.*

There remains the first alternative, that Jesus (and perhaps His disciples) began their mission with a proclamation of the coming Kingdom of God, with One, called the Son of Man, as its Head, *before His own consciousness of Divine Sonship*. Was it the Enoch Son of Man (or the Son of Man-Enoch), the Messianic Deliverer of the Similitudes and representative of the new Israel ?

In the Lucan version of the incident at Cæsarea Philippi, when the disciples are asked by Jesus, 'Whom say the people that I am ?' (9^{18}), the answer recorded by this Evangelist is, '. . . some say, Elias: and others say, that one of the old prophets is risen again (ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη)' (cf. 9^{8}). 'A certain prophet of the ancients' is usually taken to refer to one of the great prophets from Amos onwards; Matthew has Jeremiah. But when the word ἀρχαῖος is applied to persons (as also to things), it as a rule refers in the New Testament to the patriarchs, or the patriarchal period.[1] Among the patriarchs, Moses and Enoch were the great prophetic figures. Have we here a reminiscence of the Son of Man-Enoch belief ? Elijah and Enoch would be most naturally connected, in view of their common translation to heaven.[2]

It is certainly apparent from Jesus' own words (Mk 9^{13}; cf. Mt 17^{13}) that He found no difficulty in accepting (and reinterpreting) the belief in Elijah *redivivus*. If He can identify the Baptist with Elijah, there is no insuperable difficulty in believing that He could come to regard Himself as Enoch *redivivus*, especially if the latter had come to be thought of as the future Messianic Judge and Deliverer of Israel.

Whether the Enoch *redivivus* legend played any part in the crystallizing of His Messianic consciousness or not, nothing seems more certain, from the Gospel evidence, than that the Prophet of Galilee did come to regard Himself as the apocalyptic Son of Man, incorporating in His own Person one of the loftiest ethical ideals of His people, that of the Similitudes, with a Divine destiny to be wrought out in terms of actual historical action and revelation.

It was not till Cæsarea Philippi that the Messianic Secret was revealed to the disciples. But the inception of the idea (and some expression of it in terms not confined to the Son of Man eschatology) was probably much earlier. It may date from the death of the Baptist (cf. Mk $9^{12ff.}$ *et par.*), and the realization by Jesus that a similar fate lay in store for Him; with the recognition of the Baptist as Elijah, the consciousness of His own destiny as Son of Man may have been borne in on Him. It may have been earlier still: it is rash to dismiss the twin episodes of Baptism and Temptation as entirely unrelated to historical facts. But what is historically clear is that it was not till Peter's Confession that His destiny was revealed, and even then His disciples failed to comprehend the manner in which their Master declared it had to be fulfilled. And they were expressly forbidden to disclose it; the secret was to be kept till the final revelation and vindication.

Nevertheless, there are several Son of Man sayings, both apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic, uttered, according to our Greek Gospels, long before Cæsarea Philippi, where the title appears to be Messianic and its reference unambiguously to Jesus Himself. How are such passages to be explained, if the identity of Jesus as coming Son of Man was not even known to His disciples ?

The answer is probably to be found in the ambiguity of the expression 'Son of Man.' No term was more fitted both to conceal, yet at the same time to reveal to those who had ears to hear, the Son of Man's real identity.[3]

In Mt 11^{19}=Lk 7^{34} (Q):

> 'For John came neither eating nor drinking,
> And they say, He hath a devil.
> The Son of Man came eating and drinking,
> And they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.'

the contrast is unmistakably between John and Jesus Himself; to attempt to read a communal meaning into the expression does violence to the whole context. Moreover, the latter is not evidently an apocalyptic one; it refers to an actual coming of the Son of Man in Jesus Himself, a man among men. Any affinities the expression has here with the old Biblical literature are with Ezekiel or the Psalter.

Would the saying be intelligible to those for whom it was intended without the expression being a Messianic title ? The passage is one of several where 'Son of Man' has been claimed as simply a synonym for the personal pronoun, and the use of Aramaic *hahu' gabra*, 'that man' for the first person compared or cited in support. But the latter is not quite the same as the phrase 'the son of man,' and *hahu' barnasha* is nowhere found. Even if it were (like the Latin *hic homo*), the absence of the demonstrative in the Greek must be explained away, and to try to do so leads into pure guesswork.[4] If however, *barnash* alone, the exact phrase in Daniel, was the original term,

[1] Cf. Mt $5^{21.\ 27.\ 33}$; Ac $15^{7.\ 21}$; 2 Co 7^{17}; 2 P 2^{5}; Rev 12^{9}.

[2] It was a common patristic belief that the 'two witnesses' of Rev 11 were Elijah and Enoch; cf. Tertullian, *De Anima*, 50; Hippolytus, *De Antichristo*, 43.

[3] Cf. J. M. Creed, 'The Heavenly Man,' in *J.T.S.*, xxvi. 136.

[4] Cf. J. Y. Campbell, 'The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man,' in *J.T.S.*, xlviii. 152 ff.

it could equally well be construed *either* as Son of Man Messianic title, *or* in the regular sense which *barnash* had come to have in Palestinian Aramaic of 'one,' 'a man,' with a reference to the speaker himself.[1] In Aramaic the saying is skilfully ambiguous.

Although the saying in Aramaic is ambiguous, there is no doubt that the Evangelists were right in interpreting it as Messianic: Jesus intended the veiled allusion to His own identity as Son of Man. But the context (and the ambiguity of the phrase) are instructive: the whole elaborate scheme of apocalyptic Son of Man eschatology has been finally brought down to earth. The final revelation of the Son of Man may still be awaited, but none the less, the Son of Man has come, in one who is man indeed; the synthesis between prophetic Scripture and Jewish apocalyptic eschatology, begun in the Similitudes, is realized in Jesus.

The other saying from Q, Mt 8^{20}=Lk 9^{58}, is not quite parallel, for there the Son of Man is apocalyptic title only,[2] and Luke's Gospel is probably historical in placing it after Cæsarea Philippi. But it also illustrates the way in which apocalyptic eschatology has been transformed by Jesus—for the Son of Man who has no place to lay His head is, like the 'son of man' in Ps $8^{4ff.}$, contrasted with the animal creation. He is no supernatural figure, but a real man, with all the human weaknesses of a man. Here indeed 'His real humanity and solidarity with mankind'[3] are brought clearly to expression.[4]

Two other well-known passages are capable of the same interpretation as Mt 11^{19}. In Matthew's version of Mk 2^{10} (Healing of the Paralytic), it is significant that the 'multitudes glorified God, which had given such power *unto men*' (9^{8}). If this verse belongs to the original story, it shows clearly that the saying of Jesus about the power of the Son of Man on earth to forgive sins had not been fully comprehended. In its Aramaic form, Jesus' Word would be ambiguous; *barnash*(*a*) might be either 'the Son of Man' or 'a man' or 'man' (generic). It was probably the arrogation of Divine authority to forgive sins by a 'mere man' which raised the cry of blasphemy from the Scribes. The second passage is Mk 2^{27} discussed above. For anyone with the least inkling of the mind of Jesus, His words were bound to suggest more than the logical meaning they have in their context; He is again speaking equivocally, with a veiled allusion to His own Person.

After Peter's Confession, 'Jesus began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected . . . and be killed, and after three days rise again' (Mk 8^{31}). From this point in the ministry the Son of Man conception undergoes an even profounder reinterpretation than hitherto, but along the same lines of a synthesis between prophetic Scripture and apocalyptic eschatology: the apocalyptic idea is combined with the ideal of the Suffering Servant of the Lord, '. . . the Son of man came . . . to give his life . . .' The synthesis is a real one, with no loss to either conception; the lowly figure of the humiliated Servant is to be exalted to the majestic rôle of Son of Man. Mk 8^{38}, with its reference to the coming of the Son of Man in the glory of His Father with the holy angels, follows close on Peter's Confession: it may, however, be later tradition, and secondary to Mt 10^{32-33}. But Mk 13^{26}, the scene before Caiaphas, and in particular the version at Lk 22^{69}, are more difficult to explain away. The whole manner of Jesus' reply to Caiaphas, its admirable reserve and restraint in His refusal to give a direct answer, is so perfectly in character, that it could never have been invented.[5]

It is Luke most of all who links together the sufferings and glory of the Son of Man, and nowhere more explicitly than at 17^{24-25}. It is true that *v.* 25 has no parallel in Matthew, and that the grouping may be due to Luke himself,[6] reproducing faithfully current Christian belief of which Ph 2 gives the classical expression. It is doubtful, however, if an idea (and ideal) so remarkable can be set down entirely to the reflection of the Early Church.

There is one outstanding mystery of the Son of Man. In almost every passage where Jesus taught that the Son of Man must suffer, He added that, after three days, He must rise again; and in Mk 9^{9}, the disciples are enjoined to reveal nothing of His divine Sonship (disclosed in His Transfiguration) till the Son of Man be raised from the dead. It has been all too readily assumed that, while the teaching on the suffering of the Son of Man must be genuine the prediction of His Resurrection, like that of His Parousia, is later and

[1] Cf. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 217 ff. An exact parallel in Aramaic occurs at *Bereshith Rabba* (ed. J. Theodor, Berlin, 1927, Section 7, Beginning). A certain Rabbi Jacob of Nibburaya had been teaching that fish, as well as other living animals used for food, should be ritually slaughtered. R. Haggai 'heard (of this), and (sent to him) and said, "Come and receive your punishment" (as a false teacher).' R. Jacob replied to him, 'A man (*barnash*) who has spoken a word according to Torah to be punished. Strange, indeed! . . .' The reference is unambiguously to the speaker himself.

[2] Cf. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 218.

[3] J. Y. Campbell, *op. cit.*, 155.

[4] In this respect, the Johannine teaching is rooted in the Synoptic conception. Cf. H. Dieckmann, 'Der Sohn des Menschen im Johannesevangelium,' *Scholastik*, ii. [1927], 247.

[5] Cf. Johannes Weiss, *Reich Gottes*, 169 ff.

[6] Cf. G. S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man*, 141.

secondary tradition. If Jesus' teaching here is authentic, how is it to be related to the teaching on the Parousia? Does His apocalyptic language simply clothe in vivid form the conviction of His Resurrection?

It is doubtful if the evidence can yield any final answer, for all we have here is the 'historical solution' of the New Testament. But if we can say now that the primitive Church was mistaken in its belief in His imminent Return, it must also be said that a Christian faith without its Advent Hope is as much a bowdlerized edition of the Apostolic Gospel as one in which the Son of Man is not risen from the dead.

Literature.

CHRISTIANITY AND HISTORY.

The Rev. E. C. Rust, M.A., M.Sc., Tutor, Rawdon College, is to be congratulated on having written in the midst of a busy pastorate at Huddersfield a book which must be regarded as a noteworthy contribution to contemporary theology: *The Christian Understanding of History* (Lutterworth Press; 17s. 6d. net). It is not, nor would its author claim it to be, a work of marked independence whether of thought or style; its particular merit is to have caught up the teaching of contemporary theological writers influential in various fields and to have presented it in an impressive, unified form. Thus there is indebtedness in the field of Biblical studies to such writers as C. H. Dodd and T. W. Manson, and in that of systematic doctrine to the dialectical theology of Karl Barth, Brunner, and Reinhold Niebuhr.

The thesis of the book may best be stated in the author's own words: 'The true meaning of historical existence is disclosed by God only to faith, for this meaning is concerned with the sovereign purpose of a personal God, to a knowledge of whom reason of itself is powerless to attain. Hence the Christian finds the truth about history in a series of historic events in which God Himself acts in order to disclose and actualize His purpose in the lives of men. These events may be treated by the scientific historian on the level of history, for they are concerned with the life and thought of a nation, the Jewish people, with the historical figure of Jesus of Nazareth, and with the history of the Christian Church. But to the eye of faith God has disclosed a deeper and eternal meaning in these historic facts, so that the Christian is able to find in them a divine revelation which is at the same time a fulfilment of the divine purpose in history.' And in the following words the thesis is as it were brought to a point: 'The centre of such "salvation-history" is the unique and unrepeatable "event" of Jesus of Nazareth in which the eternal God enters history to fulfil His purpose. In this event the full meaning of history is disclosed, and beyond it history cannot move; it is eschatological, embodying the end of history.'

The thesis is familiar to students of recent theology. It is worked out in plain and sober terms and with a certain logical insistence. In Part I, 'The Basic Principles,' the Christian understanding of history is distinguished from the understanding or interpretation of it in philosophies that, on the one hand, have borrowed ideas from the scientific and naturalist categories of thought and closed their eyes to spiritual reality; or, on the other, have sought in an eternal order the ultimate meaning of human life and history and to a greater or less degree denied such meaning to history and the temporal order. Among the philosophies of history here reviewed and criticized, however briefly, are those of Buckle and Spengler, Marx, Hegel and the Speculative Idealists.

In Part II, 'The Course of Salvation-History and Its Eschatological Framework,' the Biblical basis of the Christian understanding of history is carefully analysed. In these hundred pages there is much useful material for the expositor. The whole treatment, beginning from Moses and ending with Paul and John, is ruled by the consideration that the true approach to 'salvation-history' is in terms of crisis evoking the mighty acts of God, and not through evolutionary categories as though the emphasis in the Bible were on discovery rather than revelation.

Part III, 'Salvation-History and World History,' takes us again into the broader field of systematic doctrine, but now with a truer appreciation of the Biblical way of approach; and we are asked to consider from the Christian standpoint such subjects as History and Eschatology, Secular History and Fallen Man, Fallen Man and Community, Salvation History and the New Humanity, Secular History and the Divine Sovereignty. The concluding chapter, on the End of History, deals necessarily with the language of picture and symbol as distinguished from that of rational analysis; and perhaps it is worth observing that in the discussion of the Biblical thoughts of Judgment and Resurrection the newer Conservatism appears to be not so far from the older Liberalism as it is inclined to think. That may be all to the good.

W. Fulton.

THE METHODISTS.

The original Methodist Movement is a major fact in English history. When Christianity, not in fashionable circles only but in the mass of the people outside the middle class, seemed dead, when the spiritual tides had ebbed to low water,

and things were much more daunting than they are now, when Montesquieu reported that in England 'every one laughs if you talk of religion,' suddenly the face of things changed beyond recognition, deep spiritual experiences rebuilt lives and characters by the tens of thousands, and leapt like a flame of fire from heart to heart. England had found her soul again. The men and women who, under God, effected this miracle are well worth studying. And here is a book, *The Early Methodist People*, by the Rev. Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net), which brings them vividly before us.

J. R. Green asserted that 'the Methodists themselves were the least result of the Methodist revival.' Certainly, under the compulsion of their religious convictions, they launched out upon adventures in educational and social and other types of reform that have had striking results. Some of these, so we are told, are to be dealt with in a further volume. Meantime the folk who did these things are photographed for us in great, even minute, detail—their spiritual experiences, their fellowship, their family life, and so on. It is a homely and intimate book, with a fund of family feeling about it, which must appeal especially to Methodists. But all of us must be impressed by the facts given us so lavishly. Faces appear for a moment, and then vanish into the mists again, but the brief glimpse remains in one's memory; like that Mrs. Seagram of whom we hear only this, that 'she never lost a friend except by death.' Wesley himself one keeps meeting at every turn, the Wesley of the Journal, that extraordinary, many gifted man, whose unceasing activity makes one feel tired, even when one is only watching him. Samuel Johnson, one remembers, liked and admired him and his mind, but complained that you could never get enough of him, because he was always too busy to be able to stretch his legs and have his talk out. Here we come on the man, true to himself, the indefatigable traveller, the amazing preacher, the harsh reader, the masterly organizer, the complete autocrat and dictator. 'If by arbitrary power,' he once remarked, 'you mean a power which I exercise simply without any colleagues therein, this is certainly true, but I see no hurt in it!' One is struck by the resemblance between the 'bands,' and even the class meetings, and the Oxford Group of to-day even in features that do not commend themselves to all of us. Here, as always, the doctrine of Perfection puzzles. When one listens to Wesley, who did not himself claim it, it seems clear enough. But when others talk of it, the mists come down again. But that may be due to my nationality. 'The doctrine of Perfection,' said Wesley, 'is not calculated for the meridian of Edinburgh. You must not preach such doctrine here.'

A. J. GOSSIP.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

One can heartily approve the plan adopted in *Religion in the Twentieth Century* (Philosophical Library, New York; $5.00). The book is a notable contribution to what one may term 'Contemporary Comparative Religion'; and the plan is to get an essay on each religion by a recognized authority on that religion, in nearly all cases an adherent of it. Thus the book cuts out much dead matter. One is given only so much of the history of each religion as to make the account intelligible. Every religion, even the most conservative, has undergone considerable development as the centuries have passed, and what one gets here is a description of beliefs as they are now held, or of rites as they are practised to-day.

Few of the twenty-eight writers are well known on this side of the Atlantic, but brief biographies are prefixed to each writer's contribution, which enables us to judge that the editor has chosen his team with discrimination.

The editor is Mr. Vergilius Ferm of Mercer, Wisconsin, who has himself been a prolific writer on Religious Philosophy, Modern Theology, and allied themes.

In his Preface he sets forth his aim and his hope. Feeling as we all do that the contemporary world is in a very parlous condition, he shares the widespread conviction that in religion alone lies any sure hope of salvation from our distresses. Religion has too long been a divisive thing among men. He longs to see it become a unitive force. There must be, he says, one world or none. And religion, he holds, has a major part to play in winning and continuing to secure that unity of mankind. In every religion God has spoken. In every faith which has survived there must be a core of truth. He does not suggest, however, that a religion of mankind should be constructed by adherents of all the faiths making a synthesis of what truth and moral value they each contain. He does suggest that all should cast aside their 'provincialisms,' and their exclusive spiritual pride, and with great humility try to understand one another, and reverting to the primitive 'prophetic' simplicity which he thinks they all had, unite mankind on those features which all more or less clearly profess. It may be objected here first that his generalization that in all religions an original 'inspired' prophetism has been succeeded by deadening 'priestism' is questionable. If Hinduism originally had its 'prophets' all memory of them has for ages perished; and Islam has not, and never had, a 'clergy.' But, more important, many of us believe that in Christianity we have God's full and final revelation, and hence from its very start Christianity has been 'intolerant,' and made claims that it alone was the faith which can save the world. And after perusal of this account of other faiths that conviction is not shaken.

As to Christianity itself a somewhat arbitrary selection of 'denominations' has been singled out for treatment. On the other hand, the main divisions have justice done them. And those chapters reveal how difficult is going to be the task of getting a re-union of Christendom. There are deep clefts, and, much as one desires and prays and works for it, the bridge is not yet in

sight. But the book is fitted, as the editor designed, to enable us to understand, one hopes with sympathy, other faiths than one's own.

W. D. NIVEN.

DR. FOSDICK'S SERMONS—POST-WAR CHRISTIANITY.

It is nearly thirty years now since the name of Dr. Fosdick came to be well known on this side of the Atlantic through the publication of 'The Manhood of the Master,' 'The Meaning of Faith,' 'The Meaning of Prayer,' 'The Meaning of Service,' all of them best-sellers. These books revealed a remarkable expository gift, as well as that individual 'touch' which carried the author into the front rank of American preachers. Since then each volume he has issued has claimed attention, and his latest to be published here is entitled *On Being Fit to Live With : Sermons on Post-War Christianity* (S.C.M. ; 8s. 6d. net).

Dr. Fosdick is now seventy years of age, and has retired from the active ministry, but there is little sign of the passing of the years in this recent book. The freshness of illustration is apparent as before, and the pungency of comment. It may be a small matter, but the text of the sermon does not seem to be so carefully hidden away as once it was : it peeps out very often in the first paragraph now. And why should a Biblical text be disguised anyhow ? One finds also a deepened sense of urgency. It is declared, indeed, in set terms. 'For many years I have tried to preach the gospel of Christ, but never with such a sense of urgency as now. The issues which Christ raises in this modern world are not secondary, decorative, peripheral, but central, a matter of life and death.' 'This situation puts a fresh and serious meaning into the use of the word "sin."'

All of us who try to preach amid the complexities of the post-war world can profit from this book, the only unfortunate feature of which is its title. Perhaps it is intended as a companion volume to the one entitled 'On Being a Real Person,' which some regard as Fosdick's best book. However that may be, it may confidently be said that there are few preachers indeed who in this twentieth century could provide half a dozen volumes of sermons so challenging and stirring as those Dr. Fosdick has given us. It is a great achievement to have held the immense throng at Riverside for so many years by the power of the spoken word, and it is an even greater achievement to transfer that spoken word to the printed page without any obvious loss of effect. Perhaps one of the reasons why the ordinary workaday sermon in Dr. Fosdick's case stands the test of print so easily is that he preached once a Sunday. Structure, illustration, consecutive and ordered thought—these are ensured by staying quietly in a room and working at one's desk. It was Charles Morgan who asked for a fifth freedom, freedom from interruption. In all the hustle of the modern ministry, with its hectic endeavour to entice reluctant worshippers to Church, we become so festooned by committees and entangled by organizations that the marvel is, not that we preach so badly, but that we preach at all. The success of Fosdick, and Gossip, and Stewart, as evidenced by their written as well as by their pulpit work, is an indication of what some young man beginning his ministry to-day might be able to do in his turn if only he could be sure of four hours a day in his study alone !

R. J. WEDDERSPOON.

THE WAY.

The Way, by the Rev. E. Stanley Jones, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton ; 6s. net), is described on the dust-cover as 'this dynamic devotional book.' It is not impossible that for some of us the juxtaposition of the words 'dynamic' and 'devotional' sounds strange in our ears. We may think of devotion as something quiet and abstracted from the world. If we do think so we think wrongly and the study of this book will show to us just how full of *dunamis* the devotional life can be and should be.

Dr. Jones sees in modern life a complete lack of design. There is no coherence in life. 'A negro woman resigning her job said, "Life here is so daily." . . . A student wrote concerning conditions at college, "things are very contemporary here."' Dr. Jones quotes a saying of Rear-Admiral Richard Byrd when he lost his bearing in the Antarctic night, and when he realized that he had missed the way—'I knew I was lost and I felt sick inside.' That, he says, is the state and the feeling of modern life. He has written this book to set men's feet upon the Way, to enable them to find it, to follow it and not to lose it any more.

The book is in the form of devotional readings for every day of the year. On each page there is at the head of the page a section or selection of Scripture and a title. And, be it said, even the very titles are stimulating to read. There follows almost a page of devotional reading. At the end of that there is a short prayer and many of the prayers are moving and beautiful in their vividness and simplicity. Finally, there is an 'affirmation for the day.' As we would expect in any book from Dr. Jones there is a wealth of relevant and illuminating illustration and of pungent and aphoristic phrase. He quotes a young army officer as saying, 'Weather in war is always favourable, if you know how to use it.' 'A detour can be made into a period of fretfulness or fruitfulness.' 'Islands of isolation are good listening posts.' 'When something happens to us then something happens *through* us.' 'As for those who lived before Christ, the answer is that nobody has ever lived before Christ. "Before Abraham was I am"' (Jn 8^{58}). 'Some people get results, others get consequences.' 'If you strip off the first three letters of "thrills"—the beginning—you have "ills"—the end.' The book is full of seed thoughts like these.

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

CONTEMPLATIVE MEDITATION.

There is not a doubt that a wide gap yawns between the religious and the secular thinking of the day. None, too, that many Christian people are dissatisfied with what their faith is effecting in them. Accordingly Mr. R. G. Coulson has given us a book, *The Way into God* (Murray; 7s. 6d. net), the twofold object of which is to help to bridge that gulf, and to make Christianity more effective to the modern mind by offering it a method of contemplative meditation, which he himself has found outstandingly useful, and which, so he believes, others could follow with a like spiritual success. Provided, that is, that they are prepared to work at it hard enough, and that they avoid the pitfalls in their path. It is not an easy book to read. The style is crabbed, surely unnecessarily so, and technical and unattractive. Though there is much of obvious value some of the thinking will not appeal to every one, such as the insistence upon deification; for which, of course, Athanasius can be called as witness. And what is offered us seems autosuggestion rather than an approach to God, and Couéism rather than Christianity. Dean Matthews, in a Foreword, has no doubt that many may be helped by it. But he admits that 'there are some for whom the way of contemplative prayer is not the open road, and they must follow the path which their own temperament indicates.' I, for one, have tried to read this earnest book with sympathy, and in humility. But it is not for me. It claims to reinterpret the gospel for the modern mind. If that be so, then I must be old-fashioned and out-of-date. For it is a very muffled and unsatisfying gospel that reaches me through it. Yet, far be it from me to deter any from making proof of it for themselves. It helped its author. And there must be many minds kindred to his who could make progress under his guidance and by the daring path he maps for them.

A. J. Gossip.

A book for all evangelical Christians on a subject very near their hearts is *The Holy Spirit and Ourselves*, by the Rev. G. F. Nuttall, D.D. (Blackwell; 5s. net). It is a book coming from experience and appealing to experience, and will be read with satisfaction and profit. Apparently the book arose from the writer's love of his favourite hymn: 'Our blest Redeemer, ere He breathed,' which is given in full at the beginning of the book, and would be as popular with many others but for its dreary conventional tune. But the book is not an exposition of the hymn. It deals with the Gift of the Spirit, the Power of the Spirit, the Guidance of the Spirit, the Discipline of the Spirit, and the Community of the Spirit. It will be welcome to, and will be read by, many as an aid to devotion.

The interaction between institutions and ideals is the subject of a little volume by the Rev. D. Howard Smith, B.A., B.D., entitled, *The Pattern in the Mount: Hebrew Ideals and their Influence on Christianity* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). The Old Testament institutions dealt with are the Law, the Sabbath, the Festivals, the Temple, the Synagogue, Priesthood and Prophecy, and the Covenant. After briefly outlining the history of each, Mr. Smith indicates the forms in which they were taken over into and perpetuated by Christianity. Ideals must always embody themselves in institutions, but 'again and again the institution tends to kill, whilst at the same time it seeks to perpetuate the ideal for which it was created.' Tension between ideal and institution has continued throughout the Christian era. When we bring our present-day institutions to the test of the insight of Jesus, it is clear that in many ways they are no longer adequate expressions even of the ideals which originally gave them birth; still less need they be adequate to the ideals as Jesus enriched them. But 'as we are again and again rebaptized in His Spirit, we are conscious of possessing the dynamic which is entirely adequate to clothe His ideals in institutions fitted to the needs of our generation.' Mr. Smith has been for twenty-five years a missionary in North China, and his book is an expansion of a series of lectures to Chinese ministers and evangelistic workers. But he is fully alive to conditions in this country—perhaps the more so because he has been able to look at the home Church with some detachment during his furloughs—and what he has to say is equally relevant to the needs of Christian teachers here. Many of his practical suggestions are well worth pondering.

After a stormy start, and though the majority of us still differ from them upon certain vital matters, the Quakers have won their way to a practically universal admiration and respect.

It is true that many of us have but a vague notion of the teaching and tenets for which they stand. This can now be easily remedied by a study of a little book of no more than a hundred and fifty pages—*The Faith of Robert Barclay*, by J. Philip Wragge, B.A. (Friends Home Service Committee; 5s. net).

It is a pity that on the cover, as also in the body of the book, there is set down the preposterous assertion of a too perfervid admirer, 'One great original theologian and only one has Scotland produced; he it is.' That is a judgment so obviously out of all proportion and simply silly that it may easily induce would-be readers to toss aside the book as of no value. That would be a pity. For it is an excellent little volume, sane, balanced, scholarly, up-to-date, and written in a wholly admirable spirit. It consists of extracts from Barclay's 'Apology,' which one gathers is not now so much read, even in Quaker circles, as admired by tradition and from a distance. And to these extracts there is added an excellent study of Barclay and of his teaching, which leads us into a wise explication of the fundamentals of Quakerism. One likes Barclay. One likes this account of him. Above all, one likes Mr. Wragge, who never

overpresses his points, who can see things from other angles besides his own, who can make admissions with a good grace, who is, it seems, the kind of man with whom one could talk for long, and be led by his good temper and reasonableness into a large measure of agreement with him. One learns that the present-day Quaker, while holding firmly to his central beliefs, has somewhat modified his views in certain directions, as every living faith must do, deepening in experience, and adjusting itself to face and meet the problems of the time. This is a book well worth perusing.

The late Archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple, was justly revered for his goodness as well as his superlative ability. But he has now attained the rank of a Biblical Personage, for his personal chaplain, the Rev. Hugh C. Warner, the Vicar of Epsom, has compiled a large volume of *Daily Readings from William Temple* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). Under each day of the year there are three excerpts from Dr. Temple's works. The book is presumably meant as a devotional aid, and will certainly serve to recall to many the pen, and in some cases the voice, of that great man. Dr. Garbett, Archbishop of York, says of the book, 'I know of no book which I could recommend more confidently to the intelligent man who is looking for answers to the questions: What is Christianity? and What is its relevance to modern life?' No one could excel that appreciation. But one important thing may be added. There are two valuable appendices, an index of subjects, and a key to references to his books. These will be specially helpful to preachers.

Pacifism may become a live issue in the near future if ominous signs fulfil themselves, and in any case the late Rev. Leyton Richards has a claim to be heard on the subject, for he was prosecuted under the Defence of the Realm Act during the first World War and fined, and he has written freely on the subject before. Shortly before his untimely death in September he prepared his answer to the question, Where would you be if Hitler had won the War? in *Christian Pacifism after Two World Wars* (Independent Press; 7s. 6d. net). He described it as 'a critical and constructive approach to the problem of world peace.' This is, of course, an able book, and what the writer says ought to be considered sympathetically, and no doubt a hearing will be, and ought to be, given to the point of view urged in those pages. It is not the purpose of this notice to enter into the controversy, but simply to direct attention to the appearance of the book. Readers will find the arguments for a Christian Pacifism presented here forcibly.

The cult of Kierkegaard goes on apace. Here appears to be the latest book in English on that Danish thinker and his teaching—*Kierkegaard Studies* (Lutterworth Press; 15s. net), by Mr. T. H. Croxall. There are books in French and German with similar titles, but Mr. Croxall distinguishes his book from those. He confesses frankly that he is a great lover of Kierkegaard. Indeed it was because of this that he learned German (to read him in the translation of Schrempf and others) and afterwards Danish (to read him in the original). And readers of this book will agree with what Lord Lindsay of Berker says in the Foreword, that it is 'a great help to the understanding of this strange philosopher, poet, theologian, in whom so many people are now, after a hundred years, finding enlightenment.'

Mr. Croxall is afraid of committing the error of being too summary in his presentation of Kierkegaard's thought, and makes special references here to his thought on (*a*) the Bible and (*b*) our own age. The treatment falls into three parts: (1) Man (choice, music, philosophy); (2) Christianity (dread, despair, paradox, hope, time-eternity, repetition); (3) God (the Father, the God-man, the Holy Spirit).

Many will be grateful to Mr. Croxall for his thoughtful and carefully documented chapters, but we are content to call attention to his treatment of the idea of 'repetition,' which provides Kierkegaard with a category of thought that recent Christian thinkers have found useful in their discussion of the thought of the realization of eternity in time through the advent of Christ. 'Thus,' it has been recently said, 'in the crisis of faith by which we enter into eternal life we die to the old and rise again to the new; we surrender our life with its temporal possibility and God gives it back to us, restoring and repeating what we surrendered in a new way and with an eternal possibility.'

A really great task has been undertaken by the American Committee for the World Council of Churches, no less than a survey of the state of the churches to-day throughout the seventy-odd nations in which they work and worship. Each nation was allotted to an expert in that region. For example, the British Commonwealth has seven sections, each dealt with by a separate writer. Continental Europe has eleven, with fourteen writers. Each of these writers was asked to have in mind a definite set of questions, such as these: How has organized Christianity emerged from the War in your country? What changes do you note? Is there more, or less, tendency to unity of spirit? What is happening in the publication of Christian literature? Missionary work? Youth work? How far are the churches conscious of the Ecumenical Movement? A prediction as to the probable future developments in your churches? Religious liberty? The result of these assignments is now published in a large volume—*Christianity To-day* (Lutterworth Press; 25s. net), under the editorship of Henry Smith Leiper. It is a great piece of work. It might easily have been of an unreadable size, but the editor has done his work well, and the information given has been strictly pruned so as to make a large, but quite readable volume. We may echo the wish expressed by the present Archbishop of Canterbury in his Foreword, that this book may be widely read and may find its way into all the important libraries of the world for the use of those who seek to know

what our Continental brethren call the Existential Church.

The Archbishops' Commission, appointed in 1946 to consider the Report of the British Council of Churches (entitled 'The Era of Atomic Power') has found itself in a rather uneasy situation which is reflected in its own Report now issued—*The Church and the Atom* (Press & Publications Board of the Church Assembly; 4s. net). Briefly speaking, its conclusion is that the possession of atomic weapons being assumed to be genuinely necessary for national self-preservation, a Government responsible for the safety of its subjects is entitled to hold such weapons in readiness, and in case of necessity to use them against an unscrupulous aggressor. Yet this conclusion is productive of many qualms of conscience in the writers of the Report, and there is a self-protective tendency to slide off into irrelevancies and even contradictions. We get—in the words of the sub-title—an excellent 'study of the moral and theological aspects of peace and war,' but not a great deal of help in facing the actual situation. The lengthy discussion of a 'just war' does not seem to meet the difficulty that a nation is the judge in the justice of its own cause and that many temptations thus arise for the victors. There is further an inclination to rest in the imposition of a merely negative justice. The Commission is afraid of large-scale idealisms, and thinks that a 'just war' must limit itself to obtaining the precise redress for the sake of which a nation went to war, and that such a war is 'a remedy for international delinquency, and not a means of making disciples of all nations.' Connected with this plea for limitation of ends is a strong and justifiable protest against any demand for 'unconditional surrender'; at the same time, the Commission has to admit that it is impossible to exclude positive and regenerative aims and that a certain transference of attention from proximate to ultimate ends may be salutary. The Commission does not wish to deny that the summons of the gospel is just to 'make disciples of all nations, and is constrained to admit that a stopping short of this, for the sake of more immediate realism, is at best a temporary compromise. We cannot help wishing that the whole Report had been more consciously dominated by the Commission's own acknowledged principles (stated towards the end of the discussion) that the conversion of all mankind must have for the Church 'at all times and in all places absolute priority.'

Two additions to the almost innumerable books on the religious education of the young are worth noting. One deals with *The Church and the Eleven-Plus* (Religious Education Press; 1s. 6d. net), a vital problem. The book is really a Report of a Committee appointed by the Bishop of Sheffield to deal with it. The presence of Canon Popham on the Committee is a guarantee of sound work, and the Report can be heartily commended to all interested in youth work on its own merits. There is a valuable study of the characteristics of this age group, and sections dealing with the syllabus, and a clear recognition of the goal of all the training in confirmation.

The other book is not so specialized—*The Church and its Children* (Methodist Youth Department; 3s. net), by the Rev. Wilfrid J. Doidge, B.A., B.D. It deals with three subjects—'The Church and the Child,' 'Some Aspects of Educational Evangelism,' and 'Practical Methods of Educational Evangelism.' Its emphasis is on the religious community throughout, but there are wise hints on ways of winning youth to its fellowship. Both books are inexpensive and well worth reading.

In *Modern Church Design*, by Mr. Richard Mellor, F.R.I.B.A., F.I.A.A., F.R.S.A. (Skeffington; 12s. 6d. net), the author says: 'This book has tried to convince you that a sound knowledge not only of church architecture but of church worship is necessary before an architect can rightly consider himself fitted to produce a church building which is successful from the point of view of worship and atmosphere, as distinct from mere aesthetic and constructional aspects.' On reading the book one must admit that, despite a tendency to write platitudes, this aim has been successfully achieved. The book covers almost the entire field of church fabric and furnishing, and though clearly written from the point of view of an earnest Anglo-Catholic, the principles laid down apply to every form of churchmanship. The style is forceful and arguments are convincing. There is an agreeable appreciation of essentials such as 'the surest way to obtain dignity in our churches so far as their appearance is concerned is to enlist space as our ally,' and, 'the course of modern architecture has been the constant need to build down to a price instead of up to an ideal.' One does not perhaps feel quite happy about the use of the word 'need,' but there is no doubt as to these being elemental truths that are often neglected.

The author has a very practical mind. Thus, in reference to fonts, he says: 'Do not include in your design any knobby ornament at low level against which the officiant will knock his knee caps.' And at the close of the book he pronounces this priceless axiom: 'It isn't much use designing something and having that thing declared to be an architectural or aesthetic masterpiece if the same thing be unsatisfactory to the poor man who has to use it every day.' We may not admire the colloquial style of this utterance, but we can wholeheartedly applaud its common sense.

The author is definite in his opinion that what he calls the 'group system' whereby church, hall, and parsonage house form one suite of buildings is always desirable. He also advocates the provision of Baptisteries when planning a church and he puts up a strong case for the placing of organ and choir in a west gallery. One of his reasons for recommending this is the lamentable behaviour of many choirs. Here, again, we see his practical mind overriding aesthetic interests.

The book is attractively presented. It contains eight full-page half-tone photographs and a number of excellent plans and drawings in the text.

The World Council of Churches, Amsterdam.[1]

The Church.

By Professor Leonard Hodgson, D.D., Oxford.

You can only understand the Christian Church if you think of it as our Lord and Master Jesus Christ carrying on His work in this world through those whom He calls to be the members of His earthly body—His eyes to see what He wants done, His feet to speed on His errands, His mouth to speak His words, His hands to do His deeds. But who are we that we should dare to think of ourselves as of any use to Him: we, with our selfishness, our cowardice, our meannesses, and petty jealousies? Our Lord has work to do for us, on us, and in us before He can work through us. We have to be rescued from the powers of evil, converted (as we put it in religious language) to penitence and faith, before we can be used as the members of His earthly body.

The Church is first the object of His saving work, and only because it is the object can it be the instrument. It is the fellowship of forgiven sinners; cleansed, forgiven, and called into the fellowship in order that He may use them as His eyes and feet and mouth and hands on earth. As a matter of history He first did the saving and then the using. He came on earth and lived that life and spoke those words which show us what it is like to be doing God's work. Then He died to win us forgiveness and freedom from sin. When we measure ourselves by that life we know our need for cleansing and forgiveness. We just can't give ourselves in the service of God like that. Then we remember that He who lived that life and died that death upon the Cross is our risen, ascended Lord who, in all the power of His victory, comes to cleanse us, to make us new creatures, to go on living that life in and through us.

If we can only understand the Christian Church by thinking of it as the Risen, Ascended Christ carrying on His work in the world through the members of His earthly body, it follows that we can only understand it if we think of it as a process going on in history. And it is one of those processes, like teaching, which can be looked at from either of two ends. From one end the teacher is communicating to the pupil a share in the knowledge already stored up in his own mind. From the other end the pupil is learning and his mind grows in knowledge as progressively he assimilates more of what he is given. So, looking at the Church from one end we see Jesus in all His victorious perfection, calling, cleansing, inspiring, and working through His fellowship of forgiven sinners. Looking at the Church from the other end we see those sinners and see them in all their weakness and sinfulness growing in sanctity and effectiveness as progressively they become more able to receive the holiness, the inspiration, the new life of spiritual power that He gives.

And one further point. Because it is an ongoing process any one event in it can only be understood if it is seen as a moment in the whole history of it. If you cut through it and look at the transverse section, you must not think that you can understand it by simply examining the details of what you see. You have killed it and have got a dead specimen under your microscope, not the living reality.

Take now this Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council of Churches from which I have just come home. It is a moment in the history of what our Lord Jesus Christ is doing in this world through that fellowship of forgiven sinners which we call His Church. Think what lies behind it. The human race has been living on this globe for some quarter of a million—two hundred and fifty thousand—years infected by evil in its four forms of ignorance and ugliness and suffering and sin. Less than two thousand years ago the Lord Jesus, God Incarnate, entered into its history, 'come,' as Mr. C. S. Lewis once put it in a broadcast talk, 'Come like a liberator landed in an occupied country to rescue its inhabitants and set them free.'

First He set His followers free from their sins, and then He set them to gather others into their company that all together, freed by Him from their sins, and bound together and to Him by His Spirit they might carry on His work of rescuing His creation from all forms of evil; from sin first and then from ignorance and ugliness and suffering. So began the history of the Church. But then note what happened. Just as He in His own human body had been immersed in the history of this world, and we men being what we are had broken that body on the Cross, so the Church, His

[1] The Assembly was divided into four main sections and members of each of these gave brief accounts of the work of the section in the B.B.C. overseas programme. Two articles are given this month and it is hoped to complete the series next month.—Editors.

continuing earthly body, was immersed in the cross-currents of human history and broken into the divisions with which we are all too familiar.

I cannot now go into all the details of that story; of the division between Eastern Orthodoxy and Western Catholicism and the eleventh century, or the break-up of the Western Church in the sixteenth. We must just remember that for the next four hundred years the divided churches went on their several ways, not much interested in one another except for each to point out how it was right and others wrong. Then, some fifty years ago, a new spirit began to move in the hearts of Christian men in their divided churches: a desire to know and understand their fellow-Christians from whom they were divided, a desire to recover the lost unity of the one body of the one Lord.

That is the history seen from below. Seen from above this present movement is the Lord Jesus inspiring His followers to repent of their divisions and through growth in love and mutual understanding to be more truly what He calls them to be—united for His service in the fellowship of His body.

But the divisions of more than four hundred years are not to be healed in five or even fifty. We are still near the beginning of this return movement to unity. What we have seen at Amsterdam is a significant moment in this activity of the Lord Jesus Christ as He is bringing His divided followers back into unity as fellow-members of His one body.

What have I seen there? I have seen a large Assembly of Christians, sent officially to represent nearly one hundred and fifty different churches, drawn from all over the world; men and women of all sorts of races, colours, and traditions. I have seen those men and women gathered together in prayer and worship, led in prayer and worship now by a Greek Orthodox priest, now by a Hungarian Lutheran, now by an American Methodist. Let me say here that of all our morning services with which we prefaced our discussions the one I personally found most helpful was led by a coloured woman—a minister of the African Methodist Church in the United States.

In our discussions I have seen Christians of the most widely different traditions—Eastern Orthodox, Lutherans, Calvinists, convinced Anglo-Catholics, and the freest of Free Churchmen. I have seen them frankly and honestly explaining themselves to one another and seeking to understand one another. Why? Because the deepest thing in all our lives was our common allegiance to one Master—our Lord Jesus Christ; and deep down in his heart each one of us knew that any man who shared in that allegiance was his brother.

Our discussions ranged over a wide variety of topics of which you will doubtless hear more in other talks in this series. My task is to speak of those which had to do with our steps towards recovering the broken unity of Christ's Church. How far did we get? I would answer that question by saying that we have taken the first step, and that it is that kind of step of which a French proverb speaks when it says that 'It is the first step that counts.' To ignore our deep differences of conviction, differences rooted in devotion to truth, convictions for which our ancestors have paid with their liberty and their lives; to pretend that these don't matter, would not build a United Church on a firm foundation, it would be like letting a wound heal over on top while poison festers within. We have done better than that. Like wise surgeons and nurses we have begun the process of draining the poison out, driven by our very love for one another to drag our differences out into the light and look at them together, conscious that it was the love of Christ inspiring our hearts that bound us together in this frank and honest facing of them.

Let me end by quoting from a statement in the Report of the first section of the Assembly—the section which dealt directly with this subject—in a Report adopted by the whole Assembly officially as it summed up the discussions. 'Although we cannot wholly meet, our Lord will not allow us to turn away from one another. We cannot ignore one another for the very intensity of our difference testifies to a common conviction which we draw from Him. The body of Christ is a unity which makes it impossible for us either to forget each other or to be content with agreement on isolated parts of our belief while we leave the other parts unreconciled. . . . We cannot rest content with our present divisions. Before God we are responsible for one another. We see already what some of our responsibilities are and God will show us more. But we embark upon our work in the World Council of Churches in penitence for what we are and in hope for what we shall be.'

That is how the Assembly has spoken. From such a beginning what may not follow?

The Church's Witness to God's Design.

By the Reverend John Foster, D.D., University of Glasgow.

In Section II of the Assembly we were a mixed crowd of about one hundred and twenty. Let me recall a few of my fellow-members, and you will be struck by the variety as well as the distinction: T. C. Chao who is China's most significant theologian; Niemoeller, hero of the Church struggle in Germany; a Swedish archbishop and a Greek; Latourette, whose *History of the Expansion of Christianity* is in seven big volumes and about a million and a quarter words; the Dutch Vice-President of the world's Y.W.C.A.; the wife of the Archbishop of Canterbury. West Africans were there, a man from Mexico, Frenchmen (and women), Indians, Swiss. We were mixed, not only in the lands of our origin, but in the Communions represented—bearded figures in long black cassocks, a brisk little Salvation Army officer, and almost every sort of tradition that you could fit in between!

But to realize the Section's variety, it is not enough to mark the difference of our complexions, or the label on each man's coat giving (below his name) his denomination. You would need to stay and listen to our discussion of Evangelism. You would hear something like this. A German delegate is speaking. 'The first thing for us to do,' he is saying, 'is to express in theological terms what is the Gospel to be preached.' That brings an American to his feet. 'Let's skip the theology, and get on to plans for a campaign.' Which one is right? A British speaker suggests that we take thought how to present our message in terms the present generation will understand, and so win a favourable hearing. A Frenchman of the Reformed tradition protests: 'We cannot hope for a favourable hearing. That is why at the heart of Christianity is a Cross. We must be prepared to continue, as the true Church always has been, a minority movement.' Which is right? A man from Central Europe is talking of the disillusion that prevails there. We must know how to preach to people who have lost hope. 'That is not true of my country,' says an Indian. 'For millions in Asia, till this generation downtrodden and illiterate, life is just about to have a meaning. We preach to people ready to hear of more abundant life.' Here we need not ask which is right, because obviously there is more than one side to the world. Let us remind ourselves that there is more than one side to most questions. Which is right?—the answer generally is 'Both.' Our being such a mixed crowd meant that we were there to correct each other.

Such methods of give-and-take need time, and with so vast a subject we could hardly do more than get going on certain lines of thought. A hundred and twenty is too many, I feel; we should have achieved more real corporate thinking if we had sub-divided. But we have the satisfaction of setting over against these difficulties two respects in which the work of our group is unique. Never before have people from traditions so widely different discussed *together* their common task of Christian witness. And never in any world conference have they left behind the distinction between nominally Christian and non-Christian lands. Everywhere to-day the Church is in a missionary situation—and we knew it.

The Section rightly saw the task as beginning in the local congregation. Its duty might be sufficiently expressed in the words, 'Let the church *be* the Church!' But to carry this out, what a revolution would be needed in many places. With some traditions the Christian duty of worship has loomed large—and that of witness has sometimes been forgotten. Some delegates urged that worship itself *is* witness. In the end we agreed that when a congregation is so filled with joy in the Risen Lord that even the outsider becomes aware of it, then the world may begin to say, 'They have got something *real*.'

The witness of many churches is marred by their failure to be a true community. Where is that 'love of the brethren' which was one of the marks of the Early Church? No, not quite unknown, as we were reminded by a German from the Russian zone. He told of congregations which were 'little islands of joyous fellowship in surrounding hopelessness,' and of non-Christian neighbours who exclaimed in surprise, 'Why, these people all *know* one another!' One of the first needs—and the Assembly kept being brought back to this in Reports from all four of its Sections—is to cleanse our churches from the worldliness which has penetrated them, bringing class distinctions and racial discrimination to break up the Christian fellowship. Let me quote this one sentence of our findings: 'It is intolerable that any one should be excluded because of his race or colour from any Christian place of worship.' The judgment of the First Assembly leaves that point in no doubt.

We spoke much of the loss of the working classes in the industrialized West. Here we saw three things as necessary—Christians should purposefully carry their religion with them into that

world where men really live. As some one said, 'The Christian life isn't just being in the choir.' Some should find their Christian service in trades unions and political parties, in local and national government, influencing in a Christian way decisions which will affect the lives of men. Above all, the Church must come again to see, as the Old Testament prophets saw, the surge of world-changing contemporary movements as related to the purposes of God, must be able to interpret to men the signs of the times, and declare, 'Thus saith the Lord.'

'Ecumenical' is a word which to some of us has come to have great meaning. We believe that each local congregation ought to know something of what it means every Sunday. Coming to church should mean that we are come to sing of 'the Holy Church throughout all the world,' and as we pray 'Our Father' to remember the world-wide family. If in the local church's life there is always held this vision of the universal Church, prayer and gifts and sacrificial service will never be wanting for the world task.

I said that this Section was unique in discussing Evangelism in its ecumenical setting. The results of this come out in a tremendous sentence in the findings: 'The evident demand of God is that the whole Church should set itself to the total task of winning the whole world for Christ.' Now I believe we could well take all the five years between now and the World Council's *next* Assembly working out the implications of that. Three points—perhaps enough to begin on—we worked out there on the spot.

First, *Lay Work and Witness*. This paragraph of the Report begins, 'This is *the* day of opportunity for the lay membership of the Church.' Of course we were good enough Church historians to know that from the beginning the chief means of Christianity's swift spread across the Roman world was the quality of life of the ordinary Christian going about his ordinary affairs. What we meant by '*the* day' was that there are many areas of modern life which we cannot imagine being penetrated otherwise. Under God, it rests with lay witness. While putting first the witness of Christian *life*, we felt it necessary to add that many are too hesitant to speak. We excuse our shyness saying, 'It's what I do that matters, not what I say.' Actually it often is the word we speak which confronts men with a challenge. We must not shrink from spoken witness.

Second comes the question of *Co-operation in Evangelism*. If it is a total task, how do we, the parts, fit together into it? Many problems had to be left for later discussion. For example, I had a long talk with a German professor. They have a record number of missionary volunteers, and no opening in sight for German missions to be resumed. Meanwhile other societies are short of candidates. Across the frontiers of the nations can demand and supply be brought to meet each other? Meanwhile the Younger Churches leave us in no doubt—Indian, Chinese, and African delegates all got up and said so—about their continued demand for colleagues from the West. *Colleagues* notice, for the Younger Churches are growing up and now that is the way of it. In some parts of the world the Church can only hold on and suffer. Such Christians must know that they enjoy a co-operation of remembrance and of prayer from every member of the world-wide Church. In other lands, because of cataclysmic change, millions are open to our message. These areas must be considered the responsibility, not only of the small Christian community on the spot, but of the whole Church—and men and money sent accordingly. Everywhere, from Older and Younger Churches alike, comes the call for the dedication of young lives to the work of the ministry and to other full-time service of Christ in His Church.

Third comes the question of *Unity*. Taking seriously the world mission means thinking again about our divisions. A bishop from India used these words, 'Disunity affects not only the preaching but the gospel preached. The gospel is not only proclamation of what Christ has done for us, but invitation into a fellowship which Christ has created. Men say, Where can I find that fellowship?—and our answer is a divided Church.' Many representatives from the West tended to be more cautious. Often they were roundly accused of being too cautious. A lively passage in plenary session was when one Report praised the motives behind recent schemes of union. An Oriental voice objected, 'We want no backhanded compliments. What we thank God for in India is not a motive behind a scheme but *the fact* of Church union.' Youthful vigour and aged caution combined, the Assembly was willing to accept this in our findings: 'The Ecumenical Movement loses significance unless all constituent Churches bear ceaselessly in mind the prayer of Christ, "That they may all be one . . . that the world may believe," and are prepared to move forward as God guides them, to further unity in faith, in fellowship, at the Table of the Lord, and in united proclamation of the word of life.'

The missionary achievements of our forefathers were due to the sense of urgency which possessed them. The nineteenth was the greatest missionary century of all the Church's history. Towards its end there rang out that bold battle-cry of the Student Volunteer Missionary Union, 'The evangelization of the world in this generation.' Later,

with some, missionary motive came to be more vaguely expressed in terms of building a better world. Often into the expression came the note of a too-easy optimism—and just as surely the note of urgency went out. What shall be the motive for us ?

It would give a wrong idea of the Assembly if I said we do not care what happens to the world. Later you will read of Section IV on international affairs. In presenting its Report the chairman said, ' The supranational fellowship has arrived for just such a day as this. *It may be just in time.*' But whatever may happen to the world we have heard again our commission to go into it. This comes at the end of our Report : ' As we have studied evangelism in its ecumenical setting, we have been burdened with a sense of urgency. We have recaptured something of the spirit of the apostolic age, when the believers " went everywhere preaching the word." If the gospel really is a matter of life and death, it seems intolerable that any human being now in the world should live out his life without ever having the chance to hear and receive it.'

So, you see, for us too, it means doing something about it in this generation.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Undying Flame.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Glasgow.

' How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace.' —Is 52^{7}.

On that August morning before the Olympic Games began in London, I, like a thousand others in a big village in Surrey, rose before six and went to the crossroads where the Olympic runner was to arrive and pass on the flame to the next torch-bearer.

One retired doctor was still in his pyjamas and dressing-gown. One old lady had her hair hanging in a long white plait. There were girls and boys on bicycles, and families in motor cars. Every one was excited, especially the youth who had the fresh torch ready to be kindled from the old one and carried on to the next halt.

Very soon a tall lad in white shorts came into view, running down the hill with a silvery torch blazing in his hand. When he stopped in the middle of the crowd the other youth held his torch to the flame till it caught the blaze, and then, while all cheered, he sped on to the next changing-place.

It happened that the first runner with his now extinguished torch in his hand came over to the roadside fountain beside which I stood to freshen himself at its waters. ' Let me feel its weight,' I asked him. So for a minute I held the silvery torch in my own hand, and imagined what it was like to be an Olympic runner.

The flame that passed on that morning had been lit in Greece and carried over mountains and plains, across rivers and seas, till it came down that Surrey lane on its way to London. It bore the message that the Olympic Games were beginning and that therefore, till they were over, all nations should keep peace and let them be undisturbed by any war.

In our day this bearing of the flame is, of course, just part of the fun, and for the sake of perpetuating a custom. For we all know by the newspapers and wireless exactly when the Games begin. But three thousand years ago, when there were no newspapers or posts or telegrams or wireless the arrival of a messenger with the news was really the way by which distant cities knew that the Games were to begin and that all fighting was to stop.

In this great torch race across modern Europe there seems to have been one accident about which the man concerned must have felt deeply ashamed. Out of kindness the newspapers said little about it and gave no names ; but it seems that at one change-over the flame was for a moment quenched. What an unhappy memory for some one, to have been the man who let the flame go out !

There is another message of peace that is being carried through the world, the peace of Jesus, the gospel of forgiveness of our sins, of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man and the hope of heaven. When I saw that crowd risen early in the morning to welcome the Olympic runner it made me think of that text in Isaiah, ' How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace.' People should be glad and eager to hear teachers and preachers who come bearing the good news of the gospel.

And if we have heard it and know it, it is our duty to be careful to pass it on, so that the glorious light of the gospel may never die.

The Traffic Signal.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

' Now is the accepted time.'—2 Co 6^{2}.

At the most important street crossings in our towns and cities stands a friend, of whom nowadays you are all being taught to take notice, the traffic signal, sending out constantly its coloured

warnings, at one moment red, at another orange, at another green. No doubt you could tell me what the different colours mean.

Red means 'Stop!' At one time, I remember, in our Church of Scotland General Assembly, a great gathering of ministers and office-bearers, a red light used to pop out on the Clerk's table to warn speakers that their time for speaking was up; and a very useful plan indeed it was for long-winded people. In life itself there are warning lights too. One is Pain. Pain is something we don't altogether understand, but it's often useful because when it flashes its warning signal it indicates something is wrong and so helps the doctor to heal it. Another little warning light is what we call Conscience. When asked what conscience was, one small boy declared, using another boy's name I may say, 'Conscience is a thing inside me what tells me when Willie Smith's done wrong.'

A very convenient sort of conscience. Only, of course, conscience is a warning for ourselves, not for others.

Now what about the next colour, the orange signal. It reminds me of an old Irish lady visiting London for the first time. She was standing at Piccadilly Circus sorely puzzled about crossing over. So she politely asked a policeman. In his joking way he explained that whenever the traffic light went red that represented England and she must stay where she was; but when the light changed to green that stood for Ireland and she could go across safely. She got across in safety, but was so pleased that, when it went green again, she went back to thank the policeman. Then when it changed to orange for a fleeting moment, she added, 'Glory be, they don't give the Orangemen much time to cross.'

In life, too, we need advice like that. Its message is, 'Be prepared,' because it is only those who are prepared, which the five foolish virgins weren't, who can seize their opportunities when they come.

Then, finally, the green colour. It means 'All clear. Come over now.' Well, there's a safe green signal in life like that. It's an invitation we can safely accept, for it is God who gives it to us through His Son, who said, 'I am the Way. Come follow Me,' and through His apostle who added, 'Now is the accepted time.'

The Christian Year.

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

The Discipline of Duty.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house.'—1 P 2^5 (R.V.).

There are times in the experience of everybody when the duties of one's station in life are particularly irksome, and one is tempted to make bitter comparisons with the seemingly easier lot of others, and even to rise in revolt or sink into self-pity. Most people have just to get over this recurring mood as best they may, for the claims of duty cannot long be denied; but it may help us to get over it better if we look at this matter of duty in the highest light we have.

Duty, let us never forget, has a place in any kind of good life. There are only two ways of living. One is to drift with the stream, to take the line of least resistance, to be guided by immediate inclination. We want money. Here is a chance to acquire some. Let us take it. We want a certain luxury. Some one offers to put us in touch with the black market. Why not? We grasp the opportunity. Not that our desires and inclinations always lead us to such questionable courses: far from it. Not all our instinctive cravings are wrong and should never be satisfied. But the point is that, however legitimate our desires and however innocent the mode of conduct to which they impel us, if we are simply carried along by our inclinations then we are hardly persons at all. We are like a leaf driven by the wind, a moth fluttering round a flame, a dog whose journey along a road consists of following a succession of scents. We don't begin to be genuine persons till we take a stand against our inclinations. We cannot abolish our instincts, and if we are wise we shall not try it, but we can say No to the conduct they dictate. To stem the drift, to forsake the line of least resistance, to cease being merely acted upon and to begin to act in response to our sense of right and wrong, in short to heed and obey the call of duty: only as we learn to do these things do we become personalities living a life that may be called good.

Moreover, duty has a place not only in any kind of good life, but it has a place in the Christian life. Many Christians shrink from facing this fact. They have a feeling that they ought to be so filled with the Spirit that God's will should be for them a perpetual delight, the very thing they long to do and rejoice to have done. They are vexed to find again and again that they are doing and enduring the things of God's appointment without relish and simply from a sense of duty. There is a saying of George Macdonald's which may help us here—'The Kingdom of heaven is not come even when God's will is our law; it is come when God's will is our will. While God's will is our law we are but a kind of noble slaves; when His will is our will we are free children.' That is the condition which Wordsworth described

> When love is an unerring light,
> And joy its own security.

It is the condition which the Psalmist knew when he cried, 'O how love I thy law' and 'Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage' But not all of us have touched such heights, or, having touched them, can remain at that level always. It is a sign of our immaturity, indeed of the old fleshly nature still active within us, that we have so frequently to take ourselves in hand and force ourselves against inclination to do what as Christians we know we ought to do. Were we

more mature in Christ we should doubtless do with a ready heart what now we have to do with real effort. But remember that this necessity of acting again and again from a sheer sense of duty is, in its own way, a testimony to the value that God puts upon you. He has no desire to sweep you along in His purposes against your will. He wants a free man's allegiance and co-operation. If to be a Christian meant the constant influx of such tides of divine feeling that you were infallibly carried through the performance of every duty without any insight or will of your own, that would perhaps be pleasant, but it would be a degradation. It would mean that God was treating you as a robot and not as a person, a moral and spiritual being, His own child. He values us and honours us too much for that.

But while we must expect to be called upon to do and to endure again and again from a sheer sense of duty, let us remember that this doing and enduring is not the same for the Christian as it is for others, since for the Christian it is set within the framework of God's great purpose of redemption for himself and for the whole world. Duty has an altogether different flavour when it is no longer mere duty but the duty God appoints in His wisdom.

For one thing, the duty God appoints can only be thought of as discipline or training. Listen to the stones in the wall of this noble building. 'We come from the hills far away, and we have passed through much to fit us for our place here. Fire and water have worked on us for ages: explosives have rent our very heart: pickaxes have broken us, seemingly without design or meaning, as we lay misshapen blocks in a quarry; but at length we were cut and trimmed and polished, a slow and grievous process, and now we are complete, taking our place in the builder's great design. You men and women are in the quarry still; therefore to you, as once to us, much that you are called to undergo is inexplicable. But hold fast the assurance that you are destined for a nobler building even than this. Already, indeed, you have your place in it. Much trimming and polishing you still need, and the Master Builder will not fail to use upon you His chosen tools of duty and suffering, but it is higher than human hands and a wiser than human purpose that is dealing with you, for you are living stones in a heavenly temple.' Yes, indeed, the irksome duty God has appointed for you and me is a new thing when viewed as discipline for our place in the divinely redeemed humanity, as the cutting of living stones for God's great house whereof His beloved Son is foundation and chief corner-stone. 'Ye also,' says Peter, 'as living stones, are built up a spiritual house.'

Moreover, since it is living stones for a heavenly temple that God is working upon, there is place in His discipline of duty for failure. He lays duties upon us that are beyond our unaided powers. He leads us to commit ourselves to tasks in which we are bound to fail. Listen to Jeremiah's almost blasphemous complaint that God had made him a prophet without warning him of all the suffering that a prophet's career would mean—'O Lord, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived.' Surely the explanation is that God knows that the end of the discipline we all most need is just that we should cease from self and turn to Him. What could be better calculated to that end than duty laid on us beyond our powers, or involvement in a situation where we are driven to our knees by the sense that we have nowhere else to go? As John Hutton has put it: 'It is a great part of the loving ingenuity of God, working through life, to get us to commit ourselves to the great obediences on motives of our own; and yet, later, when those poorer motives break down or are thwarted, we find that Something has come to us which enables us to go on without those lower supports. Many a man begins with himself and ends with God.' Blessed then is duty and even failure in duty, if they cause us, beginning with ourselves, as living stones for the heavenly temple, to end with God.

First Sunday in Advent.

Christ—The Interpreter.

By the Reverend J. Vincent Ross, B.D., Rutherglen.

'If there be . . . an interpreter . . . to shew unto man what is right for him.'—Job 33^{23} (R.V.).

In his immortal allegory John Bunyan places the Interpreter's house by the side of the highway to the Celestial City. To that house every wise traveller will repair to check his bearings and be routed for the journey. That was a sure instinct on Bunyan's part.

In the drama of Job, one of the characters, Elihu, is trying to explain to Job the meaning of life and the ways of God with men. Suddenly the overwhelming hugeness and impossibility of his task break in upon him and he exclaims fervently 'Would God there were an interpreter, some genius of a man who could make ordinary folk understand eternal truth.' Elihu is speaking for every thinking man. As a modern writer puts it, 'Something like a sign written in the sky . . . so that all men could see and read. . . .'

Great music and painting and drama all need to be interpreted before the unskilled layman can adequately understand. Life too is like that. We need an interpreter to explain its significance. And it is just at that point that Jesus Christ's relevance becomes undeniably clear. The Incarnation is the story of God sending His best interpretation of Truth to man 'The Eternal Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld . . .' the interpretation.

> Blind unbelief is sure to err,
> And scan His work in vain;
> God is His own interpreter,
> And He will make it plain.

Jesus is God's Interpreter, to make plain to men the purposes of God.

What, then, are the functions of Jesus as Interpreter?

1. The first task of the interpreter *is to translate*

ideas from one language to another. Before we can understand the ideas of some great foreign thinker most of us need an interpreter to translate these ideas into our own familiar dialect. Even in the great branches of learning, like Science, Higher Mathematics, Medicine, or Philosophy, before the ordinary man can appreciate them he must have an interpreter to translate the peculiar technical jargon into the every-day tongue of the man in the street. That is the kind of thing that Professor Hogben has done for Science and C. E. M. Joad has done to popularize the famous philosophers.

Jesus Christ achieved this in the realm of religion and morals. On one occasion Jesus turned upon His friend Peter, who was trying to persuade Him to alter His plans. 'Get behind me, Peter, you're a Satan, your thoughts are not God's thoughts.'

God has a set of ideas, His truths and plans and purposes, which He has been trying for centuries to 'get across' to men. The task of Jesus is to take these ideas away from all the technical language of theology or philosophy or ethics and translate them into the language that the ordinary man can understand.

What farmer can fail to understand the psychology of the human soul, when Jesus puts it like this. God gives away His truth like a man sowing his seed. Some falls by the unreceptive wayside and the birds of the air pick it up. Some falls on stony ground and has little depth of root. Some falls among thistles which quickly crush out its life. Some falls on good fertile soil.

What family man will find the doctrine of God too complex when Jesus figures it out in familiar idiom. You ordinary fathers have children whose happiness and good you seek at every turn. When they ask for bread you don't give them a stone. God is like that—a great and loving Father always seeking the good of men and women who are His sons and daughters.

And undeniably the best interpretation of the love of God is when Jesus puts it into deeds, and stages the drama of Calvary; dies to prove God's love and forgiveness. The wayfaring man though fool cannot mistake it. Jesus has translated it plainly.

2. A second task of the interpreter *is to explain hidden meanings.* Bradley, the famous English philosopher, in his notable book, *Appearance and Reality*, tries to show us that things in reality are not always the same as they appear to us. Truth is not nearly so simple and obvious as some people imagine. Take that table at your elbow. The plain no-nonsense man would naturally say: 'That table is a genuinely stable, solid, material object with length and breadth and height.' But the scientist tells us that we are too simple and naïve and obvious. The table is composed of a mass of whirling atoms, protons and neutrons. It is a manifestation of fluid atomic energy.

Jesus does that same job in the realm of religion and morals. At the end of the journey down the Emmaus road, the friends of Jesus exclaimed: 'Did not our heart burn within us while . . . he opened to us the scriptures?' Do you see the significance of that? These men knew their Scriptures, as few of us know any book. They knew its history, its stories, its prophecies and its psalms. Yet they said—it was a closed book until Jesus explained and interpreted its hidden meanings.

There are many questions to-day to which we accept conventional answers. But the truth goes deeper than any superficial answer. Society decrees that a good man is one who does not fall foul of social laws or etiquette, who observes the conventional, respectable decencies. Jesus says that is too superficial and simple. Goodness essentially has nothing to do with conventions and laws, nothing to do with what a man eats or drinks. It is concerned with the quality of his disposition, his ideas, imaginations, desires, purposes, and plans; with motives that come out of his heart. He goes down deeper and explains the hidden meanings.

Or take a storm centre of the modern world—what is man? Some people say 'he's just a high-class animal like any other beast of the field.' Others, 'he's just an extra intricate mechanism like any other bit of the universe.' Others, again, say 'man is just a cypher, an insignificant pawn to be moved around at the dictate of the All-Powerful State.' Jesus says: These interpretations are too simple. Man is a creature made in the image of God, a son and heir of everlasting life. Open your New Testament for yourself and you will be surprised to see the number of hidden, lurking meanings which Christ makes plain.

3. A third task of the interpreter *is to introduce.* David Grayson in one of his charming books tells us of a talk he had with a friend. 'Do you know what I'd like to be called, Vedder?' 'I'd like to be called an introducer. . . . I'd like to say to my friend Mr. Blacksmith, "Let me introduce you to my friend Mr. Plutocrat. I could almost swear you were brothers so near alike are you. You'll find each other wonderfully interesting once you get over the awkwardness of the introduction." "And Mr. White Man, let me present you particularly to my good friend Mr. Negro. . . . You will see if you sit down to it that the curious colour of the face is only skin deep."' That is over-simplifying some problems—but one truth shines clear.

It is a great vocation in life to be an introducer, helping men over the barriers of misunderstanding and ignorance and suspicion. And Jesus Christ was in the business first. Down the centuries He has been introducing strangers to each other—men of different tastes and temperaments and cultures, men of differing classes and creeds and tongues and nationalities. 'They shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God.'

And the most important introduction that Jesus ever engineered was to introduce men to the unknown God. Centuries ago a voice speaking out of the dark night, cried, 'There is no mediator, no introducer, no man to stand in between God and man and help them to meet.'

The centuries went past, and one day a man called Saul of Tarsus sat down and wrote to a friend, 'there is one God, and one mediator, one introducer, between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.' At last, God is real. The interpreter has done his biggest job.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

True Liberty.

BY THE REVEREND R. B. OWEN, B.A.,
PRESTATYN.

'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.'—2 Co 3^{17}.

If there is one word in our vocabulary which has taken on a new urgency of meaning in these latter years it is certainly the word 'Liberty.' Throughout the grim years of our struggle against the forces of tyranny, Liberty was the watchword of our endeavour; to preserve it alive on the face of the earth we counted no sacrifice too great and no burden too heavy. It is not long since we avowed our readiness even to die rather than see the light of Liberty put out.

But quite honestly have we really sat down to think of what Liberty means and what are its implications? If we have thought on this matter at all, our tendency has been to give to this word an exterior rather than an interior meaning. Some of us would speak of Liberty as a political right. We would equate it with the democratic principle of 'government of the people, for the people, by the people.' Others of us would probably give it a more social meaning. We would assert it to be the inalienable right of every man to think for himself, to speak for himself and to act for himself as a member of a free society.

It is not for me to suggest that Liberty has not all these 'external' meanings. Political and social freedoms are very real things. Let us thank God for all who have laboured and who have laid down their lives to secure for us these benefits.

But my point is this: that external Liberty is not enough; indeed it can become a dangerous illusion, unless it is rooted and grounded upon Liberty within the soul of man himself. Some one has truly said 'Liberty conceived of as a public question is far simpler than Liberty achieved as a spiritual possession.' Yet here is the unique contribution of our Christian faith. The New Testament is the Charter of human Liberty in the one primary sense of that word, which is the spiritual sense. It proclaims and declares One who offers to every man irrespective of class, colour or race, the gift of a freedom 'within' which is the basis of every freedom 'without'—and that One is Jesus Christ.

True, therefore, to the genius of the gospel, the greatest apostle of freedom the world has ever known declares: 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' Underlying those words there is this obvious inference, that where the Spirit of the Lord is not, where the Mind and Spirit of Jesus Christ do not operate, it matters not what is your political system or your form of government, it matters not how freely you may speak or think or act, there is no Liberty. For the Apostle Liberty was not something humanly devised or manufactured, it was a gift of God in Christ offered without money and without price.

If Paul was alive to-day I think he would have something very pertinent to say to many of us. 'Ah,' he would say, 'you people who are boasting in your freedom, in your political rights and social privileges, look within yourselves. Are you free within?' No man on searching his own soul is not disturbed by the fact that there are powers working within us—Paul calls them the powers of darkness—which destroy the peace and unity of our lives. We are dominated, enslaved by these hidden forces of evil passion, lust, pride, self-will—these are our captors. Don't you see how grimly possible it is for men and women to be politically free, socially free, and yet morally enslaved, bound hand and foot to their own sins?

Now let us be certain of one thing, there is no human power in all the world that can liberate a man from the enslaving power of sin. Only Christ can do that. Do you recall those pathetic words of Macbeth to the doctor?

> Canst thou not minister to a mind diseas'd,
> Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
> Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
> And with some sweet oblivious antidote
> Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff
> Which weighs upon the heart?

Whereupon the doctor sadly replies:

> Therein the patient must minister to himself.

Shakespeare knew the impotence of the human heart too well. And so did Paul. Who of us can ever forget that agonizing cry from the heart of his Epistle to the Romans: 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' and who cannot be thrilled with his answer, 'I thank God through Jesus Christ'? Paul found his liberator in Jesus Christ. And ever afterwards, whether on the highways of Asia Minor, or in the narrow streets of Corinth, or even in a prison cell at Rome, this man counted himself the freest person in all the world.

Ah, yes, true Liberty is a spiritual thing. There is a sense in which you can't fight for it, you can only enter into it. I certainly would be the last to say that political Liberty is not worth having. No one who has lived through these terrible years can deny that. But I do say again that all our external liberties can bring little or nothing vital to us unless we know 'the glorious liberty of the sons of God.'

But how are we to know this Liberty from the thraldom of self and the power of sin? That is one of the most important questions we could ever ask.

Here it is that we strike upon one of the profound paradoxes of the spiritual life—the paradox of Authority and Freedom. Not all the philosophy of the world has yet succeeded in resolving that paradox. Yet in actual experience we know that freedom is born of an inner authority, a sense of

compulsion within the soul of man himself. We find liberation in the measure that our life is controlled by a dominant purpose.

Take, for example, Handel, the great composer. It is said that there was no freer soul in all the realm of music than George Frederick Handel. Yet once you have heard Handel, you would detect him anywhere. Why is it? The reason is not far to seek. Handel is revealed and betrayed by his own cadences. They creep in everywhere. The cadences of this man dominated him, and in the process of doing so, set him free to haunt the world with the strains of his immortal music.

Or think again of Captain Scott of the Antarctic. Was there ever a man who breathed the spirit of Liberty more than this gallant Englishman? Yet he, too, was mastered and dominated by a consuming purpose. From his youth up he heard the call of the Great White South. The vision of it gripped him, fascinated him, beckoned him on. It was just this vision, this call, this inner compulsion—call it what you will—that set Scott free to traverse and ultimately to die at the ends of the earth.

It was not otherwise with Paul, the great adventurer of the Spirit. Ask this prophet of Liberty to give you the secret of his freedom and here are some of his answers: 'The love of Christ constraineth me.' 'I am a bondservant of Jesus Christ.' 'Necessity is laid upon me; Woe is me if I preach not the gospel.' Paul had found Jesus Christ, or rather Jesus Christ had found Paul. He had taken possession of him. He had become his Lord. Have you noticed how constantly and inevitably the Apostle speaks of the 'Lord Jesus Christ'? Not Christ the Teacher or the Reformer, but Christ the Lord?

And that is Liberty—'Where the Spirit of the Lord is.' So it is with us. We are set free only when we are mastered by One who is worthy of mastering us—and that One is Christ. Offer yourselves as the bondservants of Jesus Christ, subject yourselves to His captivity, yield your minds to the authority of the truth as it is in Him, let Him control your affections and govern your will—then you will find that in Him and in His service there is perfect freedom. You remember His own words: 'If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.'

That is why Jesus Christ is the key to the world situation. He offers Liberty not as a slogan, but as a living, pulsating experience, and when men and women accept His Lordship they become the pioneers of a new humanity, who will bear the torch of freedom down the shadowed valleys of this world, and will lighten the future with faith, hope, and love. Will you say with George Matheson:

Make me a captive, Lord,
And then I shall be free;
Force me to render up my sword,
And I shall conqueror be.

Say that, and mean it, and you will not only know the joy of peace within but you will be helping to lay the foundations of a world free from want, from fear, and from tyranny, a world at peace with itself and with God.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Challenge of Want and Woe to the Christian.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU, DUNBARTONSHIRE.

'None might enter into the king's gate clothed with sackcloth.'—Est 4^2.

This was one of the stern decrees issued by the Court of Ahasuerus. It casts a revealing light upon the life of Oriental monarchs and it is easy to understand the motive and purpose of this ancient law. The courtiers arranged everything so carefully that their king should not be upset or disturbed by anything unpleasant. Like the gods of the ancient classic world, he was to live in his luxurious palace, 'careless of mankind,' and no sound of human sorrow was permitted to enter the golden gates to mar 'his sacred everlasting calm.'

But if we are to be of any use at all in the world, we cannot live our lives after this fashion. George Meredith once cried, 'Strike, sacred reality,' and all those who have struggled to better the life of the world have never shrunk from knowing at close quarters the conditions under which their fellows live. Thomas Carlyle, dour realist, gave us a very downright picture of a great city viewed from an eminence, and George Macdonald, the Scottish novelist who loved and admired Edinburgh, was fully aware it had a seamy side. Here is how he has described it as he saw it. 'But the Canongate and the Cowgate! Oh such houses! Oh filth! and misery! and smells! and winding common stairs! and grated, unglazed windows on all the landings! and squalid figures looking down from two, three, four, five, six, seven storeys!' But King Ahasuerus was never allowed to know that any of his subjects were living under such conditions as these. It was an enactment of pure selfishness and isolationism of the worst kind.

But I wonder if this old law has been entirely abrogated by our hearts in our contacts with the sombre and tragic aspects of life. I am sure that somewhere and somewise this example of Oriental self-protection does prick our consciences, because we are still tempted to thrust out of our thoughts and lives the things that disturb our peace, as we think of the plight of others, and the wrongs under which so many labour and suffer.

1. We have, then, first of all, fearlessly and sternly to drag out into the light this unwillingness to face up to the inequalities and conscience-smiting things which cause a revulsion of feeling in our minds and hearts. Nay more, we have to contemplate the horrors of evil which is still rampant, and ask ourselves in the light of Christ, who was crucified 'without the gate,' what they signify to us. Take, for example, the stark revelations of the past seven or eight years. The callous, cold-blooded infliction of torture, pain and death upon millions of our fellow-creatures, which stirred us at that time—are we to lose sight of the

challenge of it all? I am sure our salvation as a nation and our deeper deliverance lie in our having the courage to gaze upon the memory of these things until their moral import gets right home.

Many people in the west of Scotland visited an exhibition of pictures by Picasso. It was a strange, bizarre collection of 'tortured' art. Many were disgusted. What they did not realize was that all this apparently uncalled-for ugliness was the result of the impact on the artist's soul of the brutality and inhumanity which he had been compelled to witness. Why this hideousness obtruded upon the minds of men? The truth was that this painter also revelled in beauty, but he felt he had a mission to placard in this way the ugliness of sin and man's inhumanity to man.

And so to those who have a passion for looking upon life only through rose-coloured spectacles and to all who pretend to themselves and others that everything in the garden is lovely, and that at least things are not nearly so bad as they are represented to be—all this revelation of the unfathomable wickedness and sin of man should come with something of the nature of a judgment upon the social life of mankind.

2. Now let us ask ourselves to what conclusions should we be led? Four vital thoughts or principles, I think, emerge.

(1) First, *a religion that can only be attained and kept by shutting one's eyes to the palpable facts about man's capacity for wrongdoing is not a religion worth having.* If our religion is just a device for lulling the conscience to sleep, a way of escaping from reality, or a means of self-delusion, false comfort, and selfish ease, then let us know that that is no religion at all. It is sheer phantasy, and a phantasy of the most puerile order. Faith has been made more difficult for all thoughtful people during these past years: but when was a full-orbed faith ever easy? It is true that we have seen the house of life rocked to its foundations.

But (2) *our religion,* if it is to be real and convincing, *must make us bold to ask God to search every department of our life's relationships.* Shall we not, then, bring all the facts bearing on our moral and social responsibilities under His Divine searchlight? The backward state of many of our fellows' lives, their deplorable ignorance of what is wholesome and uplifting, the ugly surroundings in which they are forced to dwell, the unhealthy housing conditions—all that must be reckoned part of our religious content and liabilities. The madness and amoral indifference of men—we must bring that too within the compass of our responsibilities, and reckon with it.

(3) If this is done faithfully by us, can we come to any other conclusion than this, that *man cannot redeem himself.* This is our universal, desperate, immemorial need. This is also the opportunity of the Christian. He must proclaim that a redeeming power has been liberated in the life of man, which is a world-force as sin is, but is stronger by far than the power of sin, because it has the all-penetrating potency of the love of God within it, and can, therefore, control, subdue, and transform the forces of evil.

(4) Consider also *the inspiration and incentive we have for a life of unselfish sympathy in the example and ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ.* He who saw the beauty in the wayside flower and in the lavish generosity of a poor woman, at the same time flamed with indignation against the children of hell. He refused to protect Himself against the sadness and sins of men, but made close contact with the leper, the utterly abandoned, the children of sorrow and want. His mission was to get near to the wearers of sackcloth, and so near that He might give them 'beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness.' 'The Lord of the hill would not dwell in the Mountain of Zion alone.' 'Christian,' Bunyan tells us, 'learnt that He had made many pilgrims princes, though by nature they were beggars born, and their original had been the dunghill.' It was He who by personal example taught us that 'it is better to go to the house of mourning than to go to the house of feasting.' And that, as Dante said, 'sorrow remarries us to God'; for, in seeking to comfort others, we may have the blessedness which comes from forgetting ourselves.

Jesus 'saw life steadily and saw it whole.' He knew the Kingdom of Hell and the Kingdom of Heaven. But He told us that we could not get into our hearts a fuller measure of the Kingdom of Heaven by ignoring all evil and so becoming sentimentalists. Evil was not just a 'shadow cast by the light; nor was the devil but an imagined symbol of the distress caused by darkness.' This King, who laid aside His royal apparel and stooped so low, gave us an example that we should follow in His steps. And He told us that at the last we shall be judged by the way in which we have done this. This is the acid test of our discipleship. 'For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat . . . Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.' Let us see to it that no selfish love of ease and comfort may keep us from ministering to all who stand in our gates clothed in sackcloth and with ashes upon their heads.

Contributions and Comments.

The Text of Jeremiah xvii. 1–2.

THESE verses are a well-known crux. The chief difficulty is in the words בזכר בניהם at the beginning of the second verse, translated in the Revised Version 'whilst their children remember,' without making satisfactory sense. I suggest that we should read בזכח for בזכר.

ב and כ were easily confounded, and such a change might lead to ר being read for ח, especially if the left down-stroke became at all blurred. Pointing בְּזִבְחֵ one might render,

And upon the horns of their altars,
where their children were sacrificed,
Upon the altars of their Asherahs
by the green trees,
Upon the high hills,
the mountains in the field.

Some other slight modifications, it will be seen, become necessary, about which opinions may differ; but the key to the solution seems in any case that given above. The Septuagint omits these verses, perhaps deliberately, and the Syriac Peshitta says nothing about children remembering: all agree that the text needs some correction. Mention of the sacrifice of children, which the prophet attacks elsewhere (7^{31} 19^{5} 32^{35}), is to be expected in a passage such as this. The use of verbs with cognate substantives is fairly common in Hebrew.

C. Lattey.

Heythrop College, Oxon.

A Note on Ephesians i. 22, 23.

It is well known that, in Armitage Robinson's Commentary, approval is given to taking *πληρουμένου* as a passive (not a middle), and translating: 'the fulness of Him who all in all is being fulfilled,' which would mean that 'to St. Paul's mind the Christ in a true sense still waited for completion, and would find that completion only in the Church' (Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*, 42, 44).

W. L. Knox also takes the participle as passive, but interprets the problematic phrase on entirely different lines, taking *πλήρωμα* as also virtually a passive participle, and paraphrasing: 'that which is filled by Him who is always being filled.' In other words, he understands the passage to reflect what he says is a commonplace of 'Wisdom' writers, and interprets it to mean that the Church is filled by Christ who, in His turn, is Himself filled by God (see *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, 164, 186).

Dibelius (in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum N.T., in loc.*) questions whether the phrase may not imply *both* these senses.

As against these interpretations, which—however different from one another—involve taking the participle, *πληρουμένου*, as a passive, the A.V. and R.V. both translate it as a middle with an active sense, so that the phrase becomes 'the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.'

But all these interpreters alike appear to assume (although A.V. and R.V. are not absolutely unambiguous) that, in any case, *πλήρωμα* is in apposition with 'the church, which is his body'; whereas the analogies in New Testament christology point rather to construing it as in apposition with the preceding *αὐτὸν* of *v.*[22]—that is Christ, not the Church His body. The participle will then, of course, refer to God and be translated as a middle with an active sense (as in A.V. and R.V.). This view, for which A. E. N. Hitchcock argued in The Expository Times, xxii. [1910–11] 91, has received less than justice. T. K. Abbott (*I.C.C., in loc.*) had already expressed himself vigorously against such an interpretation years before Hitchcock's rehabilitation of it, but it is questionable whether his objections are valid. The first is that it would make the clause 'which is his body' a worse than useless insertion; the second is that if the words *τὸ πλήρωμα* were in apposition with *αὐτόν*, they should come immediately after it; whereas 'as they stand they could only depend on *αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν*, "gave Him to be *πλ.*," which does not yield a possible sense.' But in answer to the first objection it may be said that the clause 'which is his body' is a perfectly natural supplement to the phrase 'appointed Him as supreme head to the Church': and even if it does not positively need a specific statement to explain to a reader that that to which a head belongs is a body, it is fantastic to describe so reasonable a redundancy as 'worse than useless'—especially in a writing so full of noble repetitions as this Epistle. In answer to the second objection one may ask:

(*a*) Is it unthinkable that, even in its present position, *τὸ πλήρωμα* may be intended to mean *ὅς ἐστιν τὸ πλήρωμα*—'He appointed as supreme head of the Church (which is his body) Him [who is] the fulness . . .'?

(*b*) If it appears that this is impossible Greek, does it, after all, yield an impossible sense if we do interpret the phrase to mean that 'God appointed Christ both as Head of the Church and as the fulness. . . .'?

To speak of *Christ* as 'the fulness of *God*' is in line not only with the phrases in Col 1^{19} and 2^{9} (where the *πλήρωμα* dwells in Him), but also with Ephesians itself; for in 4^{10} Christ is said to have both descended and ascended *ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα*—that is, that He might be as all-pervasive as God Himself. But to speak of the *Church* as 'the fulness of *Christ*' is (however suggestive and however compatible with New Testament teaching) quite unparalleled in the New Testament, except for the famous Col 1^{24} (*ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ χριστοῦ . . . ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ*); and even that refers rather to the 'full complement' of necessary sufferings than to Christ's 'fulness' absolutely.

A study of the Biblical uses of *πλήρωμα* confirms the conclusion (which Armitage Robinson reached also on etymological grounds) that it means not 'that which is filled' but either 'that which fills' or 'the result of filling—the full complement'; and it is in keeping with the christology both of Colossians and of the rest of Ephesians to say that God has made Christ's scope (if one may put it so) the same as His own: *ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ.*

C. F. D. Moule.

Clare College, Cambridge.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Psychology of Prophecy. From Scandinavia comes another large and important book, this time from Norway and from the hand of I. P. Seierstad, dealing with the psychology of prophecy.[1] It is primarily limited to the study of Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, though it touches at several points other prophets. The author does not think that prophecy is to be understood merely in terms of the psychology of the prophet, but finds in that psychology only one side of a subject-object relation in whose totality it is to be grasped. Hence he not only examines the accounts of the calls of these prophets to discover how far they are hallucination or dream, but considers the revelation of God mediated to them through their experience, and finds it to be other than the upsurge of their own thought.

He is strongly critical of the 'ecstatic' view of prophecy, as applied to his chosen prophets, and argues that though the prophet is the mouthpiece of God and delivers his message often in the first person, he yet clearly differentiates himself from God, and, in the case of Jeremiah, can even be critical of the constraint which he is powerless to resist. The strange acts to which appeal is sometimes made, such as Isaiah's appearance naked and barefoot, are found to be no ecstatic acts, but volitional acts whose import is in harmony with the conscious message of the prophets. While the reviewer is unconvinced by the extremer forms of the 'ecstatic' theory, he would not repudiate it so sharply as does Seierstad, or distinguish between these prophets and earlier prophets in quite so clear-cut a way as is here done.

The author finds the characteristic message of these prophets to be a religio-ethical one, and holds that it is by the objective test of the ethical and spiritual demands their word makes upon men that they compare it with the word of the prophets who were opposed to them. Following Mowinckel, Seierstad argues that while other prophets claimed to be possessed by the spirit of God, these prophets believed that they had the Word of God. The contrast seems to the reviewer again to be oversharply made, though he finds much here to be well said. The book is not easy reading, but it will well repay careful study. The range and variety of its discussions can only be very inadequately indicated here, and the points singled out for comment are merely those that have most interested the reviewer. The author is well acquainted with the large literature of the subject, and if it would be possible to supplement his bibliography with a few titles, it must also be acknowledged that it contains far more which were unknown to the reviewer.

The Earliest Hebrew Historical Work. Professor G. Hölscher published in 1942 a work which has only recently reached this country, dealing with the J Document of the Old Testament under the title *The Beginnings of Hebrew Historical Composition*.[2] In this he first reviews the material which he ascribes to this document, whose narration he finds to span the period from the Creation to the Disruption, and whose end he finds in 1 K 12^{19}. He thus carries this document down further than Cornill and Budde, whereas many scholars have disputed whether it should be carried down anything like so far. Hölscher, in agreement with Mowinckel, believes that the E Document also started from the beginnings of time, and that some sections of it have been incorporated in the J account of the Creation story. The materials used by the historian were largely isolated traditions of varied origin, which reached him almost exclusively in oral form. Here again one of the recent tendencies of research in this field has been to emphasize written as well as oral sources behind the main corpora of traditions. The careful examination of the materials leads the author to classify them as myths, hero-tales, local traditions, ætiological stories, and anecdotes, and to hold that while historical memories were in varying degree preserved in some of them, full history was reached only in the account of David's reign beginning with 2 S 9. For the story of David apart from this he was compelled to rely on isolated, and often not very detailed, traditions.

The composition of the work is ascribed to *c.* 800 B.C., and the author is held to have been a Southerner who collected traditions of all the tribes, but who viewed everything from a Judæan and anti-Canaanite point of view. He had a strong bias against Saul, and is held to have manipulated his materials to make them yield the lessons he wished to teach. He was unfriendly to Solomon, whose desertion of the ideals which should have guided him necessitated the breach in the national unity, but he still cherished the ideal of a united and free Israel. While few of the main critical positions of this work are new, this full study of the ancient history with which it deals is of high value.

Studies in Deuteronomy. Professor G. von Rad, whose studies on Chronicles [3] and on the Priestly Code [4] are well known, has now published a short but valuable monograph on Deuteronomy.[5] He first examines the stylistic characteristics of the book and shows that even the part which is often referred to as the Code is not really a Code at all, but is presented in the form of an address to the community by Moses, with older legal provisions taken up into it and reinforced and commended.

[1] *Die Offenbarungserlebnisse der Propheten Amos, Jesaja und Jeremia* [1946]. Dybwad, Oslo; Kr. 20.00.

[2] *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung* [1942]. Winter, Heidelberg.

[3] *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes* [1930].

[4] *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch* [1934].

[5] *Deuteronomium-Studien* [1947]. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen.

The author then turns aside to contrast the form with that of the Holiness Code, which has the form of a Divine speech and not of a Mosaic address, and whose provisions are in part to be communicated to the people and in part to the priests alone. This is followed by a study of the use of the Name of God in Deuteronomy, in contrast to the Glory of God in the Priestly Code. Here von Rad connects the former with the Shechem amphictyony and the latter with the southern confederacy based on Hebron. Next comes a careful study of the sacred war in Deuteronomy, which again shows a reworking of older material. The combined interest in the reform of the cultus and in the political strength and independence of the nation is found to be of significance for determining the origin of the book, which must come from a period of religious and political revival. The final study is devoted to the theology of history which governs the Deuteronomic books of Kings. Here he brings out not only the interest in the Jerusalem sanctuary and the connexion between religious loyalty and prosperity, but the emphasis on the Divine purpose running through the history, represented in part by the repeated stressing of fulfilled prophecy, but even more by the undeviating grace toward the house of David. The termination of the Deuteronomic history in the deliverance of Jehoiachin from prison is thought to be not without significance here. Like all von Rad's work this little study is stimulating throughout.

The Geography of Judith. Professor Friedrich Stummer, who is now back at his post in the University of Munich, from which he was removed by the Nazis in 1939, when the Theological Faculty of that University was abolished, has published a brief study of the *Geography of the Book of Judith*.[1] He disclaims any desire to draw conclusions as to the historical character of the story, and starts from Miller's suggestion that the author was familiar with the topography of Samaria but not with that of the wider regions referred to in his book. Professor Stummer then carefully examines all of the geographical data of the book, and concludes that the author may have had access to an ancient map, on the basis of which he created his work on artistic principles. For the date of the work we are then carried into the Hellenistic period, long after the composition of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*. An appendix offers a study of the Vulgate renderings of the geographical names in the book.

H. H. ROWLEY.

Manchester.

[1] *Geographie des Buches Judith* [1947]. Verlag Kath. Bibel-Werk, Stuttgart.

Entre Nous.

The Englishman's Religion.

Of the making of anthologies there is indeed no end. Perhaps it is the great failing of scholarship in our generation that it is so content with books about books instead of turning to the original books itself. But there can be nothing but glad welcome for Mr. Ashley Sampson's anthology, *The Englishman's Religion* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). In the Preface the editor says 'The pattern of English religion has not always been easy to trace in every age; but a real attempt has been made to provide the English reader with a home-made brew—with something that contains all the necessary ingredients, and will give all the essential flavour of the Englishman's religion.' The book is laid out on strictly chronological lines. It begins with *Beowulf* and ends with a letter of an airman to his mother which was found amongst the personal belongings of an R.A.F. bomber pilot in a Bomber Squadron, who was reported missing, believed killed. It may well be that there is something symbolic in the fact that both the first and the last items are anonymous for that very fact shows that religion in England is a thing of every man, and not of any chosen few.

Certain things emerge from this collection. One is the strongly practical bent of English religion. This tendency emerges in 'A Lyke-Wake Dirge,' an ancient anonymous poem.

If ever thou gavest meat or drink,
—Every nighte and alle,
The fire sall never make thee shrink;
And Christe receive thy saule.

If meat or drink thou ne'er gave nane,
—Every nighte and alle,
The fire will burn thee to the bare bane;
And Christe receive thy saule.

So Wyclif declares in his 'Apology,' 'Fastings are not necessary, while a man abstaineth him from other sin. And as to this I say thus, that fasting generally is not only forbearing of meat and drink, but in forbearing of evil, and all evil spite, and in doing good deeds.'

So Kingsley writes, 'One good man, one man who does not put on his religion once a week with his Sunday coat, but wears it for his working dress, and lets the thought of God grow into him, till everything he says and does becomes religious, that man is worth a thousand sermons—he is a living Gospel—he comes in the spirit and power of Elias—he is the image of God.'

Another characteristic that emerges is the consistent English love of justice and of freedom. So John Stuart Mill in his classic Essay 'On Liberty' demands for all men 'liberty of conscience in the most comprehensive sense; liberty of thought and feeling; absolute freedom of opinion and thought

and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral or theological.' He goes on to demand, 'liberty of tastes and pursuits; of framing the plan of our life to suit our own character; of doing as we like, subject to such consequences as may follow. . . . Freedom to unite for any purpose not involving harm to others; the persons combining being supposed to be of full age, and not forced or deceived.' That might well have been written for to-day.

Still another characteristic that emerges is the extraordinary nobility of prayer that great Englishmen so often had in great moments. So Drake prays before Cadiz: 'O Lord God, when Thou givest to Thy servants to endeavour any great matter, grant us also to know that it is not the beginning, but the continuing the same unto the end, until it be thoroughly finished, which yieldeth the true glory.' So Sir Jacob Astley's prayer is here, 'Lord Thou knowest how busy I must be this day. If I forget Thee do not Thou forget me.'

There is much that is familiar in this book. One of its great merits is that it brings together within its compass so many of the things that we often wish to read and to use and find difficulty in immediately laying hands upon. It is an ideal bedside book, an ideal desk companion.

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

The Cause of Unbelief.

'We live in an age of great technical and scientific achievement. This achievement is the result of a prolonged concentration of thought and energy. But when human beings concentrate their minds upon a particular purpose they form a mental habit which makes it difficult for them to think in any other way. We know only too well that man's spiritual life can be destroyed by the ordinary vices, worldliness or lust or ambition. It is possible also that the religious sense may be atrophied by a one-sided preoccupation with a single aspect of truth. This, Headlam thought, was the real cause of religious disbelief. . . . It is not surprising that, when men like Huxley and Freud fall into this snare, lesser men should rush into the fray and seek to reshape the universe in accordance with every succeeding discovery of science. The harm can be prevented only if men recognize their limitations and give up the idea that they can explain reality in terms of their own limited observation.' [1]

Ernest H. Hayes.

We have received five volumes of 'The Concise Guide' series, founded and edited by Mr. E. H. Hayes—*The Primary Concise Guide, The Beginners' Concise Guide, The Junior Concise Guide, The Young Peoples' Concise Guide,* and *The Senior Concise Guide* (Religious Education Press; 5s. each). And the appearance of these admirable books is a reminder of the amazing fertility of their editor and the invaluable work he has done for many years for the religious education of the young. It is impossible to estimate the contribution he has made to this great cause. It is not, perhaps, an error to say that he invented the 'method' which is pursued in all his 'Guides'—the fruitful analysis of a theme, its bountiful illustrations from life and literature, its insight into the needs of youth, its spiritual perceptions. Nothing better has appeared for the religious instruction of young people of all ages than these 'Guides.' No teacher need feel at a loss with them in his hands. Indeed the only complaint that can be made is that he does too much for the teacher. Better that, however, than starvation! Mr. Hayes is now associated with Canon Popham in the fine work the Religious Education Press is doing by its stream of first-class books. Emphasis is laid on Mr. Hayes' work because it is time his devoted and successful labours were gratefully recognized.

Sunday Only.

The following paragraph appeared in Dr. Peel's 'Notes by the Way' in *The Christian World* for 9th September. 'The ways of film censors in the United States have long been past finding out, but we cannot but believe that the story of the Massachusetts censor is manufactured. His ukase is said to have read: "Eliminate scene showing man kicking girl. *N.B.* This elimination applies only to Sunday showings."'

Serving His Fellow-Men.

Frances Perkins in *The Roosevelt I Knew* tells of a group that clustered around the White House on the night he died. 'The young soldier sighed as I nodded to him, and, still looking at the house he said: "I felt as if I knew him." (A pause.) "I felt as if he knew me—and I felt as if he liked me."' And then she says, 'Roosevelt belonged to every one.'

Miss Perkins, a woman of vast experience in labour and social administration in America is the first woman in the U.S.A. to have attained Cabinet rank, and she was for many years in close and confidential relations with the President. In one place she tells that he asked her prayers, knowing that she shared his religious attitude, and she makes this comment—worth the consideration of those impressed by some of Barth's utterances—'He'—President Roosevelt—'saw the betterment of life and the people as part of God's work, and he felt that man's devotion to God expressed itself by serving his fellow-men.'

---

[1] A. C. Headlam, *The Fourth Gospel as History.*

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

OSTAL TUITION

R THE LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D.

M.Th. DEGREES; DIPLOMA IN THEOLOGY

ndon University degree examinations are en to all. University residence is unnecessary. ndidates may read at home; those over 23 may e the shorter Special Entrance, instead of the atriculation, Examination.

Many ministers have secured London B.A., D. & M.Th. degrees through entrusting their ire preparation to Wolsey Hall. In the hands of perienced and sympathetic graduate tutors home dy becomes a pleasure. Fees are moderate, and y be spread over the period of the Course. reover, should you be compelled to suspend discontinue the Course, for *any* reason, *no* ther instalments are payable beyond those due the time. In the event of failure, tuition is con- ued *free of charge.*

LONDON UNIVERSITY B.D. (EXTERNAL) 1948:

WOLSEY HALL

students obtained

1 of the 2 FIRST-CLASS HONOURS

and 5 of the 8 Second-Class Honours, in all, OVER HALF THE 'HONOURS' LIST

WOLSEY HALL STUDENTS ALSO FORMED THE ENTIRE 'PASS' LIST

PROSPECTUS FREE

ite for the Wolsey Hall Prospectus, mentioning the mination which most interests you. You may obtain py post free and without incurring the least gation from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 41,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

PROPRIETORS: DIPLOMA CORRESPONDENCE COLLEGE, LTD.

LUTTERWORTH PRESS

The Christian Understanding of History

E. C. RUST

The problems of contemporary civilisation and the final destiny of man considered in the light of God's activity and purpose. An able exposition of the Christian philosophy in relation to others. 'Of particular interest to church people of an enquiring turn of mind.'—*Birmingham Mail.*

(*Lutterworth Library*). 17*s.* 6*d. net.*

The Beginnings of Western Christendom

L. E. ELLIOTT BINNS

The author of *Religion in the Victorian Era* shows that Western Christendom had distinctive features from the earliest times, and that it had a unity of 'culture' other than that imposed by the Papal See. (*Lutterworth Library*). 25*s. net.*

Kierkegaard Studies

T. H. CROXALL

Foreword by Lord Lindsay of Birker

'Succeeds admirably in his main purpose of demonstrating the relevance of Kierkegaard's teaching to our understanding of the Bible and the needs of our own age.'—*Birmingham Post.*

15*s. net.*

Secret Journey thro' Spain

BJÖRN HALLSTRÖM

An exposure of the persecution of the Protestant church in the 'only country in Europe where the Bible is forbidden literature.' 'Deserves a wide circulation. It should be read by all Englishmen who value freedom, but thousands upon thousands of whom are utterly ignorant about the iron curtain in the south. . . . '—*The English Churchman.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

Christian Ethics & the Gospel

D. E. W. HARRISON

Three lectures given by the Archdeacon of Sheffield at a Moral Welfare Conference in June of this year. A valuable and concise statement of the ethical teaching of Jesus Christ and of St. Paul with a final chapter setting out the relevance of this teaching for to-day. 1*s.* 6*d. net.*

LUTTERWORTH PRESS

4 BOUVERIE STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

HODDER AND STOUGHTON'S RELIGIOUS BOOKS OF THE YEAR

Christian Marriage

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE. By KENNETH E. KIRK, *Bishop of Oxford.* 7s. 6d. net

Church and State

WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT? By CYRIL GARBETT, *Archbishop of York.* 6s. net

Christian Unity

CHRISTIAN UNITY: The Anglican Position by G. K. A. BELL, *Bishop of Chichester.* 6s. net

The Ministry

THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY. By T. W. MANSON. 6s. net

William Temple

DAILY READINGS FROM WILLIAM TEMPLE. Compiled by HUGH C. WARNER. 10s. 6d. net

Youth

THE FELLOWSHIP OF YOUTH. By EDGAR PRIMROSE DICKIE. 6s. net

Spiritual Growth

POWER FROM ON HIGH. By CHRISTOPHER TATHAM. 6s. net

Woodbine Willie

THE BEST OF STUDDERT KENNEDY. Compiled from his writings by a Friend. 8s. 6d. net

Philosophical Theology

THE REALITY OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. By HENRY BETT. 9s. 6d. net

Bampton Lectures

THE SECULAR AND THE SACRED. An Enquiry into the Principles of a Christian Civilization by P. A. MICKLEM. 10s. 6d. net

A Classic

VISION AND AUTHORITY. By JOHN OMAN. 15s. net

Our Lord's Earthly Life

THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD: A Reconstruction and Interpretation of the Life of Christ. By GREVILLE COOKE. 15s. net

These distinguished books are only part of the Hodder and Stoughton religious publishing programme. If you would like to know about our new and forthcoming religious books regularly, please send your name and address to—The Religious Editor, Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., St. Paul's House, Warwick Square, London, E.C.4.

The Publishers are

HODDER AND STOUGHTON, LTD.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 16s. 6d. net*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£7, 7s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*